THE

# ANTI-JACOBIN

# Review and Magazine;

*&c. &c. &c.*

For SEPTEMBER, 1803.

---

Aliena negotia centum
Per caput et circa ſaliunt latus. HOR.

---

## ORIGINAL CRITICISM.

*Account of the Life and Writings of Thomas Reid, D. D. F. R. S. Edinburgh; late Profeſſor of Moral Philoſophy in the Univerſity of Glaſgow.* By Dugald Stewart, F. R. S. Edinburgh; read at different Meetings of the Royal Society. 8vo. Pp. 222. 5s. Creech, Edinburgh; and Longman and Rees, London. 1800.

IN our laſt number we preſented to our readers an account of Stewart's Life of Robertſon. That biographical performance was the production of a man of genius and erudition, deſcribing another man of genius and erudition who purſued a different courſe from himſelf. In the work before us, he exhibits a mind which was exerciſed in ſimilar purſuits with his own; between whom and him there was not merely the ſympathy of ſuperior talents; but alſo the coincidence of intellectual habits. The author was extremely intimate with the ſubject of his biography; and, as his own writings have ſhewn, profoundly converſant with his writings; which, as he was thoroughly competent to comprehend, he was one of the firſt juſtly to appreciate. The life of a contemplative philoſopher is, in its nature, devoid of materials which often conſtitute the moſt prominent parts of biography. This want our author acknowledges in his introductory paragraph.

"The life," he ſays, "of which I am now to preſent to the Royal Society a ſhort account, although it fixed an æra in the hiſtory of modern philoſophy, was uncommonly barren of thoſe incidents which furniſh materials for biography;—ſtrenuouſly devoted to truth, to virtue, and to the

beſt intereſts of mankind; but ſpent in the obſcurity of a learned retirement, remote from the purſuits of ambition, and with little ſolicitude about literary fame. After the agitation, however, of the political convulſions which Europe has witneſſed for a courſe of years, the ſimple record of ſuch a life may derive an intereſt even from its uniformity; and, when contraſted with the events of the paſſing ſcene, may lead the thoughts to ſome views of human nature, on which it is not ungrateful to repoſe."

Thomas Reid was born on the 26th of April, 1710, at Strachan, in Kincardineſhire, a country pariſh ſituated about twenty miles from Aberdeen, on the north ſide of the Grampian Mountains. His father, the Reverend Lewis Reid, was miniſter of the pariſh for fifty years, and reſpected by all who knew him for his piety, prudence, and benevolence. For ſome generations a conſiderable portion of literature diſtinguiſhed the family of the Reids. His maternal houſe was no leſs eminent for literary endowments. His mother was ſiſter to the Gregories, who were remarkable for mathematical ſcience; one of whom was profeſſor of aſtronomy at Oxford, and an intimate friend of Sir Iſaac Newton. A ſecond was profeſſor of mathematics at St. Andrews, and a third at Edinburgh. Theſe were the firſt perſons who taught the Newtonian philoſophy in the northern univerſities. Young Reid went to ſchool at Kincardine, and at firſt gave no proofs of ſuperior abilities. His ſchoolmaſter, however, foretold, that he would turn out to be a man of good and well-wearing parts. "A prediction," ſays our author, "which, although it implied no flattering hopes of thoſe more brilliant endowments which are commonly regarded as the conſtituents of genius, touched, not unhappily, on that capacity of patient thought which contributed ſo powerfully to the ſucceſs of his philoſophical reſearches."

From ſchool he was ſent to the univerſity of Aberdeen, and after continuing there the uſual time he was appointed librarian. This ſituation was acceptable to him, as it afforded an opportunity of indulging his paſſion for ſtudy, and united the charms of a learned ſociety with the quiet of an academical retreat. Here he very cloſely ſtudied mathematics. In 1736 he made an excurſion to England, and became acquainted with characters of the firſt literary eminence. Returning to Scotland he, in 1737, was preſented to the living of New-Machar in Aberdeenſhire; and here he appears to have ſpent the greater part of his time in the moſt intenſe ſtudy; more particularly in a careful examination of the laws of external perception, and of the other principles which form the ground-work of human knowledge. His chief relaxations were gardening and botany, to both of which purſuits he retained his attachment even in old age. His firſt publication was in the Philoſophical Tranſactions of the Royal Society of London, for the year 1748. It is entitled, *An Eſſay on Quantity, occaſioned by reading a Treatiſe, in which ſimple and compound Ratios are applied to Virtue and Merit.* Of this work our author preſents an analyſis, and concludes that the metaphyſical reading of Mr. Reid was not yet very extenſive. In 1752 he was elected profeſſor

of

of philoſophy in the univerſity of Aberdeen, in which ſituation he greatly enlarged his acquaintance with pneumatology and other branches of philoſophy. Soon after his removal to Aberdeen, he, in conjunction with Dr. John Gregory, projected a literary ſociety, which ſubſiſted for many years, and which ſeems to have had the happieſt effects in awakening and directing that ſpirit of philoſophical reſearch, which has ſince reflected ſo much luſtre on the north of Scotland. The number of valuable works which iſſued nearly about the ſame time, from individuals connected with this inſtitution, more particularly the writings of REID, GREGORY, CAMPBELL, BEATTIE, and GERARD, furniſh the beſt panegyric on the enlightened views of thoſe under whoſe direction it was originally formed.

"Among theſe works," ſays our biographer, "the moſt original and profound was unqueſtionably the *Inquiry into the Human Mind*, publiſhed by Dr. Reid in 1764. The plan appears to have been conceived, and the ſubject deeply meditated, by the author long before; but it is doubtful, whether his modeſty would have ever permitted him to preſent to the world the fruits of his ſolitary ſtudies, without the encouragement which he received from the general acquieſcence of his aſſociates, in the moſt important concluſions to which he had been led."

Reid had once adopted the Berkleian ſyſtem of the non-exiſtence of matter, but in inveſtigating the philoſophy of Hume he was convinced of the falſhood of that hypotheſis. Of the doctrines contained in Dr. Reid's enquiry his biographer, without deſcending to an analyſis, mentions the grand purpoſe. "His great object was to record and to claſſify the phenomena which the operations of the human mind preſent to thoſe who reflect carefully on the ſubjects of their conſciouſneſs; and of ſuch a hiſtory, it is manifeſt, that no abridgment could be offered with advantage." Here our biographer marks a very important epoch in the hiſtory of pneumatology. "The idea of proſecuting the ſtudy of the human mind, on a plan analogous to that which had been ſo ſucceſsfully adopted in phyſics by the followers of Lord BACON, if not firſt conceived by Dr. REID, was at leaſt firſt carried ſucceſsfully into execution in his writings." The influence of the general views opened in the *Novum Organum*, may be traced in almoſt every page of his writings; and, indeed, the circumſtance by which theſe are ſo ſtrongly and characteriſtically diſtinguiſhed, is, that they exhibit the firſt ſyſtematical attempt to exemplify, in the ſtudy of human nature, the ſame plan of inveſtigation which conducted NEWTON to the properties of light, and to the law of gravitation. Mr. Stewart here marks a diſtinction between the inventive powers which conſtitute genius, and the inveſtigating efforts and inductive proceſſes which lead to true philoſophy, and illuſtrates it from a paſſage in Dr. Reid's writings.

"It is genius," ſays that philoſopher, "and not the want of it, that adulterates philoſophy, and fills it with error and falſe theory. A creative imagination diſdains the mean offices of digging for a foundation, or removing

moving rubbiſh, and carrying materials: leaving theſe ſervile employments to the drudges in ſcience, it plans a deſign, and raiſes a fabric. Invention ſupplies materials where they are wanting, and fancy adds colouring, and every befitting ornament. The work pleaſes the eye, and wants nothing but ſolidity and a good foundation. It ſeems even to vie with the works of nature, till ſome ſucceeding architect blows it into ruins, and builds as goodly a fabric of his own in its place."

Soon after the publication of his Inquiry, Dr. Reid was invited to the moral philoſophy chair by the univerſity of Glaſgow, on the reſignation of Adam Smith. His plan comprehended a view of the intellectual and active powers of man; a ſyſtem of practical ethics; the general outlines of natural juriſprudence, and the fundamental principles of politics. A few lectures on rhetoric, which were read, at a ſeparate hour, to a more advanced claſs of ſtudents, formed a voluntary addition to the appropriate functions of his office. His biographer, who had been his pupil, gives the following account of his preceptorial character.

"The merits of Dr. Reid, as a public teacher, were derived chiefly from that rich fund of original and inſtructive philoſophy which is to be found in his writings; and from his unwearied aſſiduity in inculcating principles which he conceived to be of eſſential importance to human happineſs. In his elocution and mode of inſtruction, there was nothing peculiarly attractive. He ſeldom, if ever, indulged himſelf in the warmth of extempore diſcourſe; nor was his manner of reading calculated to increaſe the effect of what he had committed to writing. Such, however, was the ſimplicity and perſpicuity of his ſtyle; ſuch the gravity and authority of his character; and ſuch the general intereſt of his young hearers in the doctrines which he taught, that by the numerous audiences to which his inſtructions were addreſſed, he was heard uniformly with the moſt ſilent and reſpectful attention."

While engaged in profeſſorial inſtruction he continued to purſue his enquiries into the human mind. In 1781 he withdrew from his public labours, and devoted himſelf entirely to literature. Though turned of ſeventy, his mental vigour was as great as in the prime of life. At ſeventy-five he produced his eſſay on the intellectual powers of man, and at ſeventy-eight his eſſays on the active powers of man. A ſection is devoted by the biographer to obſervations on the ſpirit and ſcope of Dr. Reid's philoſophy.

The great object of his ſtudies was to recommend the plan of Lord Bacon for enlarging human knowledge, and eſpecially to apply the new organ to inveſtigations concerning the human mind. Our biographer exhibits a view of the philoſophy of Bacon, and ſhews the reſult of its application to different ſciences, eſpecially on the knowledge of the human mind; and preſents an account at once hiſtorical and ſtatiſtical of pneumatology to the time that Dr. Reid commenced his labours. In the opinion of the biographer Dr. R. was the firſt who conceived juſtly and clearly the analogy between natural and moral philoſophy: "defining with preciſion the diſtinct provinces of obſerva-

obſervation and of reflection, in furniſhing the *data* of all our reaſonings concerning matter and mind; and demonſtrating the neceſſity of a careful ſeparation between the phænomena which they reſpectively exhibit, while we adhere to the ſame mode of philoſophizing in inveſtigating the laws of both.—He has exemplified with the happieſt ſucceſs, that method of inveſtigation by which alone any ſolid progreſs can be made; directing his enquiries to a ſubject which forms a neceſſary ground-work for the labours of his ſucceſſors,—an analyſis of the various powers and principles belonging to our conſtitution." For this purpoſe he recommended and exemplified an analyſis of our moſt important intellectual and active principles, and this was the object of his various philoſophical publications, which were different ſtages of the ſame enquiry. In his firſt performance he confined himſelf entirely to the five ſenſes, and the principles of our nature neceſſarily connected with them; reſerving the farther proſecution of the ſubject for a future period.

Our biographer enters at great length into Dr. Reid's mode of analyſis, and anſwers various objections that have been made to his doctrines, and eſpecially to the remarks of Dr. Prieſtley. To follow the objections and anſwers would occupy much more ſpace than we can beſtow on metaphyſical controverſy: the reſult, however, is, according to his biographer, that Reid uniformly applied the inductive mode of enquiry to the human mind; that he made very conſiderable advances himſelf in his reſearches, and held out to others the guide that was to conduct them to farther knowledge of the human mind, and of its application to the practical buſineſs of life. Reid himſelf, however, has ſimply exhibited the principal facts that tend to develope the mind, without carrying his reſearches to the numerous relations by which pneumatology is connected with the practical buſineſs of life. The purſuit and attainments of Dr. Reid, concerning the human mind, our author conſiders as bearing nearly the ſame relation to the different branches of intellectual and moral ſcience, (ſuch as grammar, rhetoric, logic, ethics, natural theology, and politics,) in which the anatomy of the human body ſtands to the different branches of phyſiology and pathology. Here we muſt make an obſervation which could not with propriety come from our biographer himſelf, that Mr. Stewart's own work on the philoſophy of the human mind, beſides much original diſcovery on ſubjects which, to uſe his analogy, Reid had to a certain degree anatomized, very happily exhibits the operation of intellectual powers in the practice of life; or, to continue the analogy, diſplays the active exertions of thoſe muſcles, veins, and bones, the exiſtence and relative poſition of which Reid had before demonſtrated and explained: and we are happy to find, from ſome incidental obſervations of our author, that he is purſuing his inveſtigations into the philoſophy of the human mind. Interſperſed with his account of the writings of Reid are very valuable obſervations by Mr. Stewart himſelf. A great deſideratum in the ſtudy of pneumatology is a ſyſtem of inductive logic formed up-

on the plan delineated in the new organ of Bacon, and applicable to the ſtudy of the human mind.

" The logical rules," he remarks, " which lay the foundation of ſound and uſeful concluſions concerning the laws of this internal world, although not altogether overlooked by Lord BACON, were plainly not the principal object of his work; and what he has written on the ſubject, conſiſts chiefly of detached hints dropped caſually in the courſe of other ſpeculations. A comprehenſive view of the ſciences and arts dependent on the philoſophy of the human mind, exhibiting the relations which they bear to each other, and to that general ſyſtem of human knowledge, would form a natural and uſeful introduction to the ſtudy of theſe logical principles."

The ſupply of this defect, we are happy to obſerve, is to make part of Mr. Stewart's farther labours. From a review of Dr. Reid's philoſophy our author returns to his life.

" With the *Eſſays on the active powers of Man*," ſays his biographer, " he cloſed his literary career; but he continued, notwithſtanding, to proſecute his ſtudies with unabated ardour and activity. The more modern improvements in chemiſtry attracted his particular notice; and he applied himſelf, with his wonted diligence and ſucceſs, to the ſtudy of its new theories and new nomenclature. He amuſed himſelf, alſo, at times, in preparing for a philoſophical ſociety, of which he was a member, ſhort eſſays on particular topics, which happened to intereſt his curioſity, and on which he thought he might derive uſeful hints from friendly diſcuſſion. The moſt important of theſe were, *An Examination of* PRIESTLEY'S *Opinions concerning Matter and Mind*; *Obſervations on the Utopia of* SIR THOMAS MORE; *and Phyſiological Reflections on Muſcular Motion*. This laſt eſſay appears to have been written in the eighty-ſixth year of his age, and was read by the author to his aſſociates, a few months before his death."

When he was turned of eighty his domeſtic comfort ſuffered a deep wound by the death of his wife. He had had the misfortune, too, of ſurviving, for many years, a numerous family of promiſing children; four of whom (two ſons and two daughters) died after they attained to maturity. His vigour of health he retained to his eighty-ſeventh year. During the ſummer, 1796, he viſited Edinburgh, and his faculties were as ſtrong as ever; but about the end of September he was ſeized with a violent diſorder, which terminated his life on the 7th of October.

" In point of bodily conſtitution," ſays his biographer, " few men have been more indebted to nature than Dr. REID. His form was vigorous and athletic; and his muſcular force (though he was ſomewhat under the middle ſize) uncommonly great;—advantages to which his habits of temperance and exerciſe, and the unclouded ſerenity of his temper, did ample juſtice. His countenance was ſtrongly expreſſive of deep and collected thought; but when brightened up by the ſight of a friend, what chiefly caught the attention was, a look of good-will and of kindneſs."

" In private life no man ever maintained, more eminently or more uniformly, the dignity of philoſophy; combining with the moſt amiable modeſty and gentleneſs, the nobleſt ſpirit of independence. The only preferment

ment which he ever enjoyed, he owed to the unsolicited favour of the two learned bodies who successively adopted him in their number; and the respectable rank which he supported in society, was the well-earned reward of his own academical labours. The studies in which he delighted, were little calculated to draw on him the patronage of the great; and he was unskilled in the art of counting advancement, by 'fashioning his doctrines to the varying hour.' As a philosopher, his genius was more peculiarly characterized by a sound, cautious, distinguishing judgment; by a singular patience and perseverance of thought; and by habits of the most fixed and concentrated attention to his own mental operations;—endowments which, although not the most splendid in the estimation of the multitude, would seem entitled, from the history of science, to rank among the rarest gifts of the mind."

Such is the substance of Mr. Stewart's account of Dr. Reid. From its subject it will be much less popular than the life of Robertson or Smith; but to metaphysical readers it will prove a very valuable accession of knowledge: it may in a few words be characterized as A STATISTICAL ACCOUNT OF PNEUMATOLOGY. From our biographer's account of the intellectual character of Reid, it would appear that he was not in a high degree endued with inventive powers, and could not properly be denominated a man of superior genius. He effected his objects by sound judgment, cautious discrimination, unwearied patience, and indefatigable perseverance. These are qualities and habits which a considerable portion of mankind possess or may attain, and one of the principal advantages which results from the inductive process inculcated by Bacon, and applied by Reid, is, that it places the attainment of philosophical knowledge within the reach of every well-educated man, of a clear and solid understanding, without requiring extraordinary capacity.

---

## Overton's *True Churchmen ascertained.*

*(Concluded from Vol. XV. p. 391.)*

WE are sorry to be under the necessity of observing, that, notwithstanding Mr. O.'s professed regard for regularity and union, his whole book is substantially one elaborate apology for schismatics and sectaries of all denomination, provided they be of the genuine Calvinistic stamp. We have heard it observed by persons of discernment that the very title of his work is schismatical, and intentionally ambiguous. It is obvious, indeed, that his "True Churchmen," are, by no means, the same with "True Members of the Church of England;" for he labours, as we have already seen, to depreciate the importance of the sacrament of baptism, and lays very little stress on church communion. We have been censured by him for asserting, in the very words of the Church of England, that she "supposes all who are baptized to be in a state of salvation;" (p. 115) and Mr. Daubeny, the correctness of whose notions on the

ſubject of eccleſiaſtical unity has rendered him an object of peculiar diſlike to this equivocal churchman, is reprobated with uncommon acrimony, and treated with groſs injuſtice, becauſe he "ſees no difference between the true Church of Chriſt and the national church; repreſents profeſſed membership with this national ſociety as forming the line of diſtinction between the world which lieth in wickedneſs and a ſtate of condemnation before God, and thoſe who are in a ſtate of ſanctification and ſalvation; and ſpeaks indiſcriminately of all who have been regularly baptized, and remain in the eſtabliſhed communion, as "members of Chriſt's body," "partakers of Chriſt's ſpirit," &c. (p 115.) "The diſtinction between the national eſtabliſhment and the true Church of Chriſt, Mr. Daubeny teaches, is unneceſſary, and a falſe diſtinction." (P. 116.) And "to the ſame purport, a correſpondent of the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers obſerves, a curious diſtinction has lately been found out between the Church of Chriſt and the Church of England." (P. 117.) The ſame ſtrain of accuſation frequently recurs (ſee pp. 264, 393); but the paſſages here quoted are ſufficient for our preſent deſign.

The candid reader of this Apology who, without conſulting the works here condemned, ſhould implicitly rely on Mr. O.'s integrity, as judging of other men's minds by his own, would, we think, from theſe paſſages, be led to infer, as our author moſt probably wiſhed him to do, that Mr. D. and our correſpondent belong to that claſs of ſpurious churchmen who ſupport the eſtabliſhment merely as ſuch, or who, to ſpeak in the faſhionable latitudinarian phraſe, "profeſs themſelves of the religion of the magiſtrate." If Mr. O. did not wiſh ſuch an inference to be drawn, for what purpoſe, we aſk, are theſe obſervations brought forward? We aſk him, we will not ſay, as a clergyman, but as a man of honour, whether, when he was executing this manœuvre to diſcredit his opponents, he was conſcious that he fairly repreſented their ſentiments, and felt no bias to conceal the truth? But we ſhall ſuffer theſe gentlemen to ſpeak for themſelves.

"In page 190," ſays Mr. Daubeny to Sir Richard Hill," you unneceſſarily put the idea into your reader's head, that "a national eſtabliſhment is *one thing*, and a Chriſtian Church *another*." I ſay *unnecessarily*, becauſe we have nothing to do with the ſubject. In this country a national eſtabliſhment and a Chriſtian Church are *one* and the *same thing*; for happily for us, they are in uniſon together. Moreover, you muſt know, Sir, that the Church of England is not defended, and the neceſſity of communion with it enforced, becauſe it is a *national eſtabliſhment*, but becauſe it is an apoſtolic church of Chriſt.

"You muſt know, if you will but give yourſelf time to conſider, that a doctrine that cries up purity to the ruin of unity, ought to be rejected; becauſe the goſpel calls for *unity* as well as *purity*. You muſt know, moreover, that every thing that is to be found in the true church is to be met with in the eſtabliſhed church of this country; all the ſound members of which 'worſhip God in the ſpirit, rejoice in Chriſt Jeſus, and have no confidence in the fleſh.'

"The

"The plain member of the church, in consequence of the false distinction here made between the *national church* and your *true church*; the fallacy of which he may be unable to discover; is led to expect something of which he is not in possession; and thereby to break away from that order and government, by which the church, as a society, was designed to be held together." (Daub. Append. pp. 475, 476.)

"A curious distinction," says our correspondent, "has lately been found out between the Church of Christ and the Church of England, expressly calculated to draw away common people from the church to which they are constitutionally attached; and because purity of doctrine is essential to the perfection of a church, therefore the government and discipline of it are artfully represented as matters of no consideration. Having laid this foundation on which to erect this mishaped irregular building, which is to supply the place of that church which has been built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, and happily established in this country; these patrons of disorder proceed, in the next place, to propagate the idea that the Calvinistic doctrine is the only pure doctrine of the church; and that the clergy who do not preach it, are but dumb dogs, ignorant hirelings, who have been called to the work of the ministry by the outward appointment of men only, but not by the *inward* calling of the Holy Ghost. These loose notions, duly scattered, are now producing an abundant harvest of uninformed, though, I trust, sincere Christians; who thinking it to be a duty they owe to themselves to choose light before darkness, leave the established church of their country, which they are taught to look upon as no church, for the sake of being joined to the pure Church of Christ, elsewhere assembled; and thus those who have been admitted members of an established Church of Christ, become schismatics on the most conscientious principle." (Anti-Jac. Rev. Vol. IV. p. 359.)

Our readers, we believe, are, by this time, convinced that the persons whose words we have here transcribed are no time serving defenders of establishments as such; and that the only reason which can be assigned for the offence which they have given our author is their not opening the church doors wide enough, and admitting every self-commissioned sectary who impudently affirms that he is moved by the Spirit to preach the gospel. But these writers maintain the Catholic principle that episcopacy is essential to the being of a church; and this is a crime which, in the eyes of a right evangelical minister, is never to be forgiven. Had Mr. O., indeed, intended fairly to meet their reasoning, his efforts must have been directed to prove, either that the Church of England is no true part of the Church of Christ, or that every schismatical congregation in the kingdom is as true a part of it as the Church of England. The former branch of this alternative we do not accuse Mr. O. of holding; but the latter, understood with certain limitations, is obviously expressive of his real opinion. His true church, like that of Bishop Hoadly and Sir Richard Hill, is mystical and invisible; and the genuine characteristic of its members is to adopt the speculative doctrines of Calvin, together with the enthusiastic reveries of methodism about conversion, experience, and grace. Such being the case, we

feel

feel ourſelves fully warranted to ſay that, according to the judgment not of the Church of England only, but of all the antient Chriſtian fathers, Mr. O. is ſo far from being entitled, as he arrogantly pretends, to the excluſive appellation of a "True Churchman," that his principles are thoſe of one who is no Churchman at all.

Mr. O., in his Strictures on Candour, complains that his "Anti-Jacobin friends," as he kindly calls us, "ſtyle his party" "ſeparatiſts," "ſectaries," "ſeceders," "methodiſts," "ſchiſmatics," "deceivers," &c. (p. 267); and refers, in the margin, to our Review for April and for June 1799. Though here, as is not unfrequently the caſe, Mr. O.'s references are incorrect, yet he ſeems particularly to have in his eye our remarks on Mr. Cecil's edition of Cadogan's diſcourſes, where ſome of theſe appellations are certainly applied to them. That Mr. O. ſhould be thus forward to recall this article of ours to the recollection of his readers, we are rather ſurprized, but by no means ſorry; for he has thereby expreſsly identified his own ſentiments with thoſe of the perſons whom we there condemned. And if ever there was a man who merited the names of which our author here complains, it was Romaine; a proud, aſſuming, diſorderly, ſelf-conſtituted, apoſtle of ſchiſm; a man who, inſtead of being panegyrized, we had almoſt ſaid deified, as a godly and conſcientious miniſter of the eſtabliſhed Church, deſerves to be remembered in no other light than that of an avowed contemner of lawful authority, and a reſtleſs diſturber of unity and peace. Yet ſuch are the men whom Mr. O. delighteth to honour. Even his favourite Mr. Robinſon can act as an overſeer or ſpiritual director of the evangelical ſquadron within a certain diſtrict around him; and can accept, without ſcruple, the occaſional aſſiſtance of the moſt notorious ſchiſmatic in England. "On the Tueſday," ſays Mr. Rowland Hill, in his ſecond Tour from London through the Highlands, &c. "called, and paſſed the evening with my old friend Mr. Robinſon, and preached a lecture for him in his church." They were, it ſeems, intimate companions at College, where Mr. Hill informs us, they "were pointed at *as out of the common way.*" This, indeed, is very likely to be true; and we blame not Mr. Robinſon for receiving, with civility, an old acquaintance. But when he employed Mr. Hill to preach for him, can we ſuppoſe Mr. R. ignorant of the Eraſtian principles and diſorderly practices of this vagrant miſſionary? The ſuppoſition is impoſſible; and, therefore, we are warranted to conclude that he does not very greatly diſapprove them. Yet Mr. H. can felicitate the people of thoſe places where the diſſenting teachers and their congregations occaſionally attend the church, and the church people attend the meetings; for "this promiſcuous hearing is," in his opinion, "a bleſſing to the place." He can boaſt of "preaching thrice in the Baptiſt meeting-houſe," and "record, with much pleaſure, that being with the good people concerned with Mr. Ryland," a diſſenting teacher, "on a communion occaſion, he was happy to be admitted to partake among them." Nay, "this *ſort of ſpiritual mix-*

*mixtures,*" he ſays, "makes the *beſt Chriſtian communions.* The children of God then find their communion with each other, not on account of their *empty dry forms and orders,* but becauſe they *feel* themſelves all one in Chriſt." This is the man whom the evangelical author of the "Scripture Characters" employs to preach his lecture; a man by whom every parſh prieſt in England, who underſtands and values the truly apoſtolical conſtitution of the church to which he belongs, would conſider his pulpit as polluted; whoſe offers of aſſiſtance he would regard as an inſult, and reject with ſcorn.

But this baſtard ſpecies of liberality is by no means peculiar to Meſſrs. Robinſon and R. Hill. It forms, in truth, a diſtinguiſhed feature in the character of the generality of evangelical miniſters. In 1796 or 1797 the Rev. Mr. Simeon, Fellow of King's College, and miniſter of a pariſh, in Cambridge, a leading man among goſpel preachers, and ſomewhere the ſubject of Mr. O.'s praiſe, paid a viſit to Scotland. While he was at Edinburgh, he waited on a clergyman of the Scotch Epiſcopal Church, and offered his aſſiſtance on the following Sunday, which was readily accepted. But before that time, the clergyman learned that he had been holding forth in a Preſbyterian Kirk; and, therefore, very properly reſolved to act as every true churchman would act in ſuch a caſe. When Mr. Simeon came to perform his promiſe, he was told that his ſervices muſt be declined; and the glaring irregularity of his practice was given as the reaſon. But this merited reproof produced no effect on the evangelical Engliſhman. From ſome goſpel miniſters of the eſtabliſhment at Edinburgh he procured letters of recommendation to ſuch of their brethren in the country as lay in his route, and were of ſimilar ſentiments. With one of theſe we know that, in his progreſs through the Highlands, he publickly communicated; and performed, we believe, ſome part of the ſervice which is cuſtomary among the preſbyterians on ſuch occaſions. Notwithſtanding the edifying liberality of mind diſplayed, on both ſides, in this *ſpiritual mixture,* the Scotch divine was threatened to be brought before his preſbytery, to anſwer for his conduct; but we have never heard that Mr. Simeon's was made the ſubject of official inquiry. We have pretty good reaſons, however, for believing that his diocеſan was fully informed of the circumſtances, ſoon after they took place. We ſhould be glad to think that our intelligence was wrong; becauſe, were any biſhop of the Church of England, after due information, to *overlook* ſo flagrant a tranſgreſſion of order, we ſhould be forced, notwithſtanding our high reſpect for the office and for every individual inveſted with it, to ſay that ſuch a biſhop was deficient in attention to the duties of his ſtation.

Mr. O.'s readers cannot fail to obſerve the fulſome flattery with which he beplanters Mrs. Hannah More. She "is a prodigy of female underſtanding and uſeful virtue." (P. 317.) "And where is the individual who has laboured more zealouſly, and more ſucceſsfully, in this important cauſe, than a celebrated female writer of the

ſame

ſame ſchool?" (P. 250) The cauſe to which Mr. O. here particularly alludes is that of order and good government in the ſtate; but we are ſure that he regards Mrs. More as, in every reſpect, a true churchwoman; and he here informs us where ſhe went to ſchool.—Of the leſſons which ſhe there was taught ſhe has not ſuffered the world to continue ignorant; but has very laudably, for the honour of her maſters, practiſed them at Blagdon, Bath, and elſewhere.—Taking this lady, therefore, for a pattern, we are pretty well qualified to aſcertain what ſort of a character Mr. O. requires in his true Churchman. With ſuperior pretenſions to exemplary piety, he may frequent, indiſcriminately, the church and the meeting-houſe. His charity muſt be extenſive and conſpicuous; but chiefly confined to his own party, unleſs when a conduct apparently the reverſe is immediately calculated to advance their influence. His efforts muſt be unceaſingly directed to the diſſemination of Calviniſtic principles, in which pious purſuit all means are lawful, being ſanctified by the end. In promoting this end, it is prudent, in order to avoid detection, to proceed by indirect and underhand methods; but ſhould he, at laſt, be unfortunately diſcovered, he muſt ſcruple no ſtep, however it might ſtartle the weaker conſciences of ordinary men, to ſave his own credit, and that of the party. This is paramount to every conſideration. The charge muſt therefore, at all events, be repelled; and if dignity ſhould be thought to require, on his own part, a ſullen ſilence, the intereſt of *friends* muſt be ſtrenuouſly exerted to impoſe on perſons in ſituations of authority, and their pens employed to blaſt the reputation of thoſe who are daring enough to ſtand forth his accuſers.—When to this we have added that he may receive the ſacrament from the hands of any ſchiſmatical teacher, whoſe ſupreme happineſs would be to witneſs the downfal of the eſtabliſhment; we ſhall have, we conceive, a notion tolerably correct of the ingredients which go to make up the compoſition of a "true Churchman." Of this character our author undoubtedly propoſes Mrs. More as a very bright and illuſtrious example; and we cannot, therefore, help being ſeriouſly of opinion that he has treated his brother, the rector of All-Saints, Aldwinckle, with great unkindneſs, and manifeſt injuſtice. The Doctor is, certainly, as orthodox a Calviniſt as any in the kingdom; and with regard to the trifling point of irregularity, we do not perceive much ground for diſtinction between him and the highly favoured Mrs. More.

On this ſubject Sir Richard Hill ſpeaks out with his uſual blunt and honeſt frankneſs. "While Mr. Jay," a ſchiſmatical teacher at Bath, "manifeſts a ſpirit of love towards the eſtabliſhed clergy, why ſhould they not, in their turn, give to him and to others of their diſſenting brethren, that right hand of fellowſhip, in which the *true unity* of the Church conſiſts?" (Daub. Append. p. 392.) But Sir R. Hill is, indeed, a goſſiping, imprudent tell-tale, and cannot keep the ſecrets of his friends; who are, certainly, never backward to ſtretch out the right hand of fellowſhip to every ſectary whoſe lan-

guage

guage accords with the Shibboleth of the tribe, while the correctest churchman they treat as an enemy, provided he talks in a different dialect. Mr. O.'s book, then, is really a defence of schismatics and schism. Of his "Regular Clergy of the Establishment, who are sometimes called evangelical ministers," it may, very generally, be affirmed that there is nothing regular about them but their ordination; and, we think, it would puzzle a more acute logician than even our learned and ingenious apologist to prove those entitled to the denomination of true sons of the Church of England, who neither teach her doctrines nor obey her discipline.

But highly reprehensible as we certainly deem Mr. O.'s publication in a variety of respects, there is nothing contained in it which has more excited our indignation and disgust than the insufferable arrogance and pride which it displays. "Humility of mind," Mr. O. observes, "highly becomes the character of Christians in their best estate;" (p. 163.) and humility of mind is most curiously exemplified in the claims which these eminent Christians advance in favour of themselves. Mr. O.'s "Appeal to experience," (pp. 319—332,) is written in a strain of illiberal and insolent boasting which is, indeed, as we have uniformly found, familiar to his friends; but which cannot fail to remind the reader, with little advantage, we conceive, to the cause of these conceited professors of superior godliness, of the Pharisee who went up to the temple to pray, and thanked God that he was not as other men. Mr. O. very plainly intimates that the votaries of Calvinistic methodism are, "like Abel, more righteous than their brother," and is not ashamed to throw a vile aspersion on the character of his countrymen by asserting that "evil reports concerning such persons often originate in prejudices entertained against them from that very circumstance." (P. 319.). He is forced to allow, indeed, that the profession of the purest speculative principles is no infallible security for good conduct;" that "such is the deceitfulness and desperate depravity of the human heart, that, to accomplish its wicked machinations, it can, Proteus like, assume every form, and present itself under every species of disguise;" and that the wild disorders of the great rebellion were produced, not by the natural tendency to be sure, but by the *abuse* of the *doctrines of grace*. He denies, however, that the doctrines which the agents in that horrid tragedy *pretended* to hold were those which he defends. "If they professed certain parts of the same system, these they so extended as to annihilate the rest, which gave another form and another spirit to the whole." But, if this will not do, he pronounces them to have been *consummate hypocrites*, and asserts that the doctrines which they professed were not really embraced. (P. 320.) But, with all due submission to our author's powers of reasoning, he would find it, we suspect, somewhat difficult to prove that the greater number of these men disbelieved the doctrines professed by them; and he has, clearly, no right to take it for granted. They display every sign of having been in earnest; and they, certainly, extended their system no farther than consist-

conſiſtency very well admitted. Their actions were the legitimate conſequences of their tenets; and Mr. O. cannot juſtly blame the true friends of our eſtabliſhments in church and ſtate when, taking warning from former times, they look, with ſome degree of apprehenſion, on the indefatigable exertions of a numerous and zealous party to diſſeminate theſe tenets, and deprecate the recurrence of ſimilar ſcenes if a ſimilar opportunity ſhould ever preſent itſelf.

The practice of diſputants, from time immemorial, has ſanctioned, as an excellent weapon of defence, the uſe of recrimination; and in wielding this weapon Mr. O. is, in general, ſufficiently adroit. But we cannot help thinking that, on the preſent occaſion, he has not employed it with his accuſtomed ſucceſs. With a view to wipe off the unſeemly ſtain which the military ſaints of the 17th century unfortunately brought on the *doctrines of grace*, he contraſts it with the "effects, at leaſt equally deplorable," which were produced, in the 16th, by the *doctrines of merit*." The frequent alluſions to this event which our opponents make, is juſt as candid and juſt as material in the queſtion, as it would be continually to refer *them* to the black conduct of thoſe zealous oppoſers of juſtification by faith alone, Bonner and Gardiner." (P. 321.) We beg Mr. O.'s pardon; but we have not ſagacity ſufficient to perceive the force of this argument. We cannot ſee how he ſhould conceive his opponents at all concerned in the black conduct of Bonner and Gardiner, unleſs, in a temporary fit of delirium, occaſioned by his over-ſtrained exertions in the righteous cauſe, he miſtook the great body of the Engliſh clergy for Popiſh prieſts, with lighted torches blazing in their hands, juſt ready to kindle the fires in Smithfield. Beſides, his opponents, we think, might allege that the cruelties of Gardiner and Bonner, deteſtable and horrid as they certainly were, are yet not *altogether* "equally deplorable" with the miſeries which were afterwards inflicted on the nation by the zealots of the doctrines of grace. They might farther allege that the doctrine of merit, however erroneous and antichriſtian, has no natural tendency to make men cruel, as the doctrine that dominion is founded in grace has to make them rebels; or, if theſe defences ſhould not ſerve their turn, they might, with great propriety, follow Mr. O.'s example, and boldly maintain that Bonner and Gardiner were conſummate hypocrites, who did not believe the doctrines which they profeſſed.

We have long been convinced that the genuine modeſty of this holy brotherhood is equal to their veracity. We ſhould, therefore, deem ourſelves guilty of injuſtice, if we withheld from our readers the following ſpecimen of that "humility of mind which ſo highly becomes the character of Chriſtians in their beſt eſtate." "Amidſt all the infirmities and imperfections, which, as 'what 'all fleſh is heir to,' the ſincere adherents to the doctrines of grace have to lament in themſelves, it cannot reaſonably be doubted, but that, taken maſs for maſs, there is amongſt them a more marked abſtinence from groſs vice, and voluptuous diſſipation; a more regular obſervance of religious

religious ordinances; a more habitual sense of divine things, and gratitude towards the Saviour; a more characteristic regard to the will and authority of God in their proceedings; more strenuous exertions to mend and bless mankind; in short, more real godliness, soberness and righteousness, than are to be found among the opposers of these doctrines. Whatever *occasional* stain evangelical tenets may have received, through the assumption of them by hypocrites, from which danger no principles are free, but to which their peculiar excellence may perhaps peculiarly expose them; wherever any considerable reformation has been effected by Christianity; any thing which has materially distinguished the characters of individuals, bodies of people, or places, from what they were before, or from such as have the mere 'form of godliness,' these doctrines have been at the bottom of it." (P. 321.)

Such pretensions in any other set of men we should certainly call, by their proper names, intolerable vain-glory, and unchristian gasconade. They are here, however, repeated, by Mr. O., *usque ad nauseam*. It is the *strictness* of their morality which offends; for "the truly righteous are disliked by the world. And, as then, he that was born after the flesh, persecuted him that was born after the spirit, even so it is now. So both Jews and heathens treated the Apostles and first Christians. So the Papists treated the most virtuous of the reformers. And so at all times has the world treated the genuine disciples of Christ; perhaps in exact proportion as they have partaken of his spirit, and trodden in his steps. It is demonstrable from fact, that it is the *living* according to the gospel, and not the *profession*, nor even the *preaching*, of its peculiar doctrines, in which the real umbrage consists." The wicked persecutors of these venerable saints "would be thought, indeed, only to discountenance hypocrisy, grimace, or enthusiasm; while they admire the beauty, and delight in the exercise of genuine virtue." But there is not in these profligate persecutors one word of truth; and "the manner in which virtue was treated when exhibited in her most perfect form, and loveliest charms, in the person of our Saviour, is a standing and irrefragable proof of the contrary." (Pp. 328, 329.)

Mr. O., we must own, has here adopted (for it is not, we believe, altogether new) a most ingenious method of branding a very large proportion of his clerical brethren as an abandoned crew of lying, blood thirsty, hypocritical villains, who are utterly lost to all sense of goodness. We were wondering what our author's opinion might be of the Christian Church for the three first centuries; for we always imagined that, before the time of Pelagius and Augustine, the doctrines of grace, as professed by our modern evangelical ministers, were totally unknown. But in this imagination we were, it seems, deceived; for Mr. O. assures us that "these doctrines were conscientiously maintained in the first ages of Christianity." (P. 322.) Of this fact he produces, indeed, no proof; and he will not, we suspect, find the proof of it a matter of trifling difficulty. We question not

Mr.

Mr. O's extenſive acquaintance with Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; we cannot, in particular, doubt of his being thoroughly verſed in the valuable writings of the primitive Fathers; and if he can produce from theſe authentic ſources, ſatisfactory evidence that the ſyſtem of Calvin has, from the beginning, been the uniform doctrine of the Church of Chriſt, we ſcruple not to ſay that he will, by exhibiting it, perform ſuch a ſignal ſervice to his party as will entitle him to a very exalted ſtation above all its defenders who have yet appeared.

In the mean time we have, what is no doubt, as good as *demonſtrative* proof, or, perhaps, even better, the infallible *ανδρα ιδη* of a goſpel miniſter, that, "whatever difficulties our ignorance may occaſion in the particular application of them, whatever abſurdities a *partial*, a *perverted*, or an *over-extended* view of the ſubject may preſent, the *fundamental* principles on which the Calviniſtic ſyſtem reſts, are incontrovertible;" (p. 355.) and we have the ſame aſſurance that theſe principles are thoſe of the Church of England. (Paſſim.) Unfortunately it happens that a very great majority of the Engliſh clergy regard, with us, almoſt all the fundamental principles of this ſyſtem as impious blaſphemies; as equally ſtanding in direct contradiction to the plaineſt dictates of right reaſon, and to the moſt expreſs declarations of Scripture. They alſo think that no two ſyſtems can be more unlike than thoſe of Calvin and of the Church of England; and what they do not believe themſelves, they certainly do not teach their people. On this account they are condemned, by our author, without mercy. Mr. O. pretends, indeed, to have proved the doctrines of the Church to be ſo clearly in uniſon with thoſe of his party, that no man of ſenſe can perceive the ſhadow of a difference between them. On this preſumption he takes it for granted that every clergyman who ſubſcribes to the ſtandards of the Church muſt neceſſarily ſubſcribe to them in the Calviniſtic ſenſe, becauſe, as he alleges, they are incapable of any other; and as many of the clergy openly avow that they do not inculcate the tenets of Calvin, he very charitably concludes that they are a ſet of diſhoneſt, mercenary knaves, who, for ſecular advantages, make a ſacrifice of conſcience; a body of perjured, reprobate wretches, deſerving to be held in abhorrence by God and all good men.

Mr. O., however, who has taken upon him, without being commiſſioned, the office of MONITOR and INSPECTOR GENERAL of the conduct and opinions of his clerical brethren, has, doubtleſs, ſubſcribed to the ſtandards of the Church in the right, orthodox, Calviniſtic meaning. Amidſt a great variety of other authorities, he has, with much propriety, called our attention to the royal declaration prefixed to the Articles, which enjoins that "No man ſhall either *print* or *preach* to *draw the Article aſide any way*, but ſhall ſubmit to it in the PLAIN AND FULL MEANING THEREOF; and ſhall not put HIS OWN SENSE or comment to be *the meaning of the Article*, but ſhall take it in the LITERAL AND GRAMMATICAL SENSE." (P. 47.) Nor is this injunction, by his own conceſſion, to be confined to the Articles;

Articles; but ought equally, in fair conſtruction, to be extended to the Liturgy and Homilies. In the uniform tenor, then, of theſe three formularies, underſtood in THE LITERAL AND GRAMMATICAL SENSE, Mr. O. perceives the pure, unadulterated ſyſtem of Calvin. In the prayer of Conſecration at the Communion, for example, and, particularly in the XXXIſt Article, he clearly perceives unconditional decrees and partial redemption, which are the foundations of Calvin's whole ſuperſtructure. In the XVIth Article he as clearly diſcovers invincible grace, and final perſeverance. In the Xth Article, in the Athanaſian Creed, in the VIIIth Article, which pronounces that Creed to be orthodox, in the Collect for the 25th Sunday after Trinity, and in the 1ſt and 4th Collects of the Poſt-Communion, he plainly diſcerns that man has no will of his own, can do nothing to promote his own ſalvation, and is nothing more than a paſſive inſtrument for God to work with. When the Church affirms, that "Almighty God hateth nothing that he hath made, and doth forgive the ſins of all them that are penitent," the literal and grammatical meaning is, that the mercy and love of God are confined to a certain number of individuals arbitrarily elected to eternal life, and that repentance is no condition of forgiveneſs. In this manner Mr. O. collects, from the authorized formularies of the Church of England all the other parts of the ſcheme of Calvin. This is really more than we can digeſt. Were a perſon unknown to us to aſſert, with apparent ſerioufneſs, that, in his mind, two and two made ten, or that, at midnight, the dazzling brightneſs of the ſun affected his eye-ſight, we ſhould feel ourſelves ſomewhat at a loſs to determine whether we ought to diſtruſt his veracity, or to deplore the unfortunate ſtate of his intellects. But our readers, we believe, are now ſo well acquainted with Mr. O. that they are in little danger of being involved in ſuch a dilemma. Their reflections, we ſuſpect, will take a very different, and more decided turn. They will, very probably, be apt to think that they have, at laſt, found out the reaſon of our author's ſingular antipathy to the word SINCERITY; and that it would have been no imputation on his prudence, if he had been more ſparing of the ſneers and ſarcaſms which he vents, ſo liberally, againſt his brethren for ſubſcribing to doctrines which they do not believe. They will ſee good grounds for forming an opinion of the REAL STRICTNESS of that morality which regulates the conduct of the "True Churchmen;" and thoſe of them who have been accuſtomed to regard with veneration our excellent eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, will ruminate, with anxious forebodings, on the conſequences which are likely to enſue from the increaſing numbers of theſe "regular evangelical miniſters;" who, in order to gain admiſſion into the Church, can ſolemnly ſwear aſſent, in a Calviniſtic ſenſe, to doctrines juſt as much in uniſon with Calviniſm as truth is with falſhood.

Mr. O. and his evangelical brethren "*very highly value* our eſtabliſhed forms of doctrine and worſhip." (P. 347.) WE too can make,

with a clear conſcience, the ſame declaration. In this reſpect, indeed, we will not yield to any ſet of men whatever, or to any individual. We are not included in the number of thoſe who long for alteration in our Articles and Liturgy, or who wiſh to ſee the clergy exempted from ſubſcription. There have been, it is true, "miniſters of the eſtabliſhment, who, *at other periods*, have complained of ſubſcription as a burden; propoſed their various ſchemes of amendment; or openly ſolicited a reformation:" (p. 17,) and we have the honour entirely to agree with our author in thinking that "the circumſtance OUGHT NOT TO BE FORGOTTEN." (P. 18.) But Mr. O. "deſigns not to recapitulate their names, and exhibit their hiſtory." (P. 17.) When he formed this reſolution, he judged, in our opinion, wiſely; and, by adhering to it, he has acted prudently. He might, otherwiſe, have been under the diſagreeable neceſſity of reviving the recollection of facts, which ſome of thoſe whom he ſeems to repreſent as firm friends to his cauſe would, probably, deſire to have buried in oblivion. He muſt, for inſtance, have given the hiſtory of the meetings at the Feather's Tavern, in 1772; of which the profeſſed object was to petition for relief from ſubſcription to the Articles. The members of theſe meetings were, at the time, we believe, pretty generally conſidered as conſiſting of Socinians, and perſons of other unſound perſuaſions. There were among them, however, if our memory do not treacherouſly deceive us, ſome divines whoſe names are every where honoured by Mr. O. with the epithets *learned*, *venerable*, and *pious*, and whoſe principles are now, as we underſtand him, perfectly evangelical and correct. Admoniſhed by the laudable example of diſcretion, which, on this occaſion, our author has ſet us, we ſhall carefully avoid, though for a different reaſon, all mention of the names of theſe divines. An oppoſite conduct on our part might be "periculoſæ plenum opus aleæ tractare, et incedere per ignes ſuppoſitos cineri doloſo." But although we highly venerate the doctrines of our Church, and deprecate all attempts to change or new model her public ſtandards, we muſt ſtill hold ſuch divines as, diſapproving of ſome things in them, openly expreſs their diſapprobation, and ſolicit what they deem a reform, to be characters infinitely more reſpectable than thoſe who, while they load them with the higheſt encomiums, and affect to conſider them as having attained "the perfection of truth," (p. 56,) yet ſubſcribe them in a ſenſe diametrically oppoſite to their ſpirit and meaning. Of the awful importance of thoſe engagements to which the clergy, by ſubſcription, bind themſelves, we entertain the moſt ſerious ſenſe. The obligations which ſuch ſubſcription implies are, indeed, of no light or trivial nature; and it would not be eaſy, we apprehend, to place them in a more impreſſive and ſtriking point of view than Mr. O. has done. (Pp. 333—336.) We muſt ever, with his Lordſhip of Lincoln, contend, that if any candidate for holy orders, or for eccleſiaſtical preferment, thinks that he has reaſon to diſſent from any of the doctrines aſſerted in the forms to which ſubſcription is required, "no

hope

hope of emolument or honour, no dread of inconvenience or diſappointment, ſhould induce him to expreſs his ſolemn aſſent to propoſitions which, in fact, he does not believe;" and that, in this affair, "no ſpecies whatever of evaſion, ſubterfuge, or reſerve, is to be allowed, or can be practiſed, without imminent danger of incurring the wrath of God." We, finally, adopt, *lubenter et ex animo*, the following weighty declaration of our author (p. 336), which we recommend to the conſcientious conſideration of all whom it may concern, and, particularly, to that of thoſe evangelical miniſters who aſſent to the doctrines of the Church of England in a Calviniſtic ſenſe.

"All attempts, therefore, to juſtify ſubſcription without actual belief of the plain doctrines of the Articles, we cannot but conſider as groſs prevarication; an attack upon common integrity; a conduct moſt unbecoming the appointed guardians of truth and ſincerity; and as juſtly expoſing the Church of which they are miniſters to the ſcorn of her enemies."

---

*Lectures on the Elements of Chemiſtry, delivered in the Univerſity of Edinburgh, &c.*

*(Continued from P. 350.)*

IN our review of the Life of Dr. Black, prefixed to theſe volumes, we adverted to the elegance and perſpicuity with which he is ſaid to have prelected from his profeſſional chair. Elegance and perſpicuity characterize likewiſe his lectures in the form in which they are now given to the public by his learned friend. By elegance, however, we do not mean brilliancy of ſtyle, of which the modeſt profeſſor probably was not ambitious; and which, as we have already obſerved, would be no ornament to a work of which the object is to detail the elements of ſcience. The only elegance of which ſuch works are ſuſceptible, is ſimplicity of language, and that neatneſs of arrangement which enables the author to ſtate with clearneſs much truth within moderate limits. This can be accompliſhed only by bringing forward the doctrines of the ſcience in a natural order; ſo as that, while nothing is taken for granted which is not obvious to the common ſenſe of mankind, every truth admitted or eſtabliſhed, may ſerve as the baſis of ſome ſubſequent demonſtration. It is not eaſy, if, indeed, it be poſſible, to form ſuch a perfect arrangement as this of the truths of any phyſical ſcience; and in no ſcience is the difficulty greater than in the ſcience of chemiſtry. Yet Dr. Black has been ſo eminently happy in his arrangement, that the reader ſees every thing preſented to his view fully and clearly, in the order in which it occurs in the courſe; and at the end of each ſection he feels an emotion of ſurprize that the doctrines which he has been taught did not occur to himſelf.

As chemiſtry treats of external objects, and the powers of nature, the ingenious Profeſſor could not enter upon his courſe by ſtating a few definitions and axioms, which, as they have their whole foundation in the laws of human thought, every man is compelled to admit as ſoon as he underſtands the terms in which they are expreſſed. This cannot be done but in the abſtract ſciences, and, perhaps, in no ſcience completely, but in pure mathematics. The work before us opens, however, with ſuch a *deſcription* of chemiſtry in its preſent ſtate as may enable the reader to comprehend its objects. To trace the ſcience from its origin through all its gradations of improvement, though not unuſual in the beginning of a courſe of lectures, could be attended with no advantage to perſons unacquainted not only with the chemical facts, but even with the ſubſtances in the hands of the chemiſt. This taſk, therefore, the author judiciouſly declines, and enters at once on his ſubject, by accurately diſtinguiſhing between chemiſtry as an *art*, and chemiſtry as a *ſcience*. From confounding theſe together, has ariſen, he thinks, the impropriety of the definitions or deſcriptions given of chemiſtry by Stahel, Boerhaave, and Macquer, &c.; and having rejected them, he deſcribes the ſcience himſelf in the following words:

"Chemiſtry is the ſcience or ſtudy of thoſe effects and qualities of matter which are diſcovered by mixing bodies variouſly together, or applying them to one another with a view to mixture, and by expoſing them to different degrees of heat, alone, or in mixture with one another, in order to enlarge our knowledge of nature, and to promote the uſeful arts."

A definition more conciſe than this, and equally perſpicuous, is given by the editor in the following words:

"Chemiſtry is the ſtudy of the effects of heat and mixture, with the view of diſcovering their general and ſubordinate laws, and of improving the uſeful arts.

"Viewing the ſcience in this light, Dr. Black divides his ſubject into the more *general* and more particular doctrines of chemiſtry. Under the diviſion of more general doctrines, he delivers, 1. An account of the more general or univerſal effects of heat. 2. The more general obſervations and diſcoveries relating to mixture. 3. An account of the chemical apparatus or inſtruments, and the manner of uſing them, or the chemical operations.

"Under the diviſion of the more particular doctrines will be given," he ſays, "a particular account of all the moſt remarkable bodies or kinds of matter, which the chemiſts have ſtudied; which ſhall be diſtributed into a number of claſſes, and conſidered in that order which, in my opinion, is beſt ſuited to their being eaſily underſtood and remembered. And, laſtly, while we thus give an extenſive view of the ſcience of chemiſtry, we ſhall not neglect the application of it to the illuſtration and improvement of pharmacy and other chemical arts. This is the ſecond great branch of my propoſed plan."

The plan is at once regular and comprehenſive; but it is not completed in the volumes before us. The memorandums on the medicinal preparations of mercury, which Dr. Robiſon found among the papers

papers of his friend, were so extremely slight and imperfect, "that ignorant," says he, "as I am of pharmacy, I could not venture to make any use of them; and the memorandums on the chemical analysis of animal and vegetable substances were not in a condition fit for publication."

The first part of the plan, however, is executed in a manner worthy of its author, and much is done towards the execution of the second. In the introduction to the first part, which is entitled, GENERAL EFFECTS OF HEAT, the Professor first ascertains what is meant by HEAT; 2dly, explains the meaning of the term COLD, and ascertains the real difference between cold and heat. 3dly. He mentions some of the attempts which have been made to discover the nature of heat, or to form an idea of what may be the immediate cause of it. 4thly, And lastly, he begins to describe the sensible effects produced by heat on the bodies to which it is communicated.

Every person knows that the word *heat* is used to denote either a peculiar sensation excited in our organs, or a certain quality, affection, or condition, of the bodies around us, by which that sensation is excited. It is in this latter sense only that the word is used by Dr. Black, who warns his readers, however, that the idea of heat, as a quality or affection of bodies, will be modified a little, and extended as the course proceeds, though the meaning of the word will continue at the bottom the same.

Having shewn the rapidity with which heat is communicated from one body to another, he observes that the first question which naturally occurs to the mind is, "In what manner have these two bodies acted, the one on the other? Has one of them lost something, which the other has gained?" This is the vulgar opinion, and it is adopted by almost every philosopher who has attended to the subject, though some of them have not been consistent in maintaining this opinion.

"When a mass of ice, for example, or a lump of very cold iron is laid on the warm hand, instead of heat being communicated from the warm hand to the ice or cold iron, they have supposed that there is in the ice or cold iron, a multitude of minute particles of frost, or frigorific particles, which have a tendency to pass from the very cold bodies into any others that are less cold; and that many of the effects, or consequences of cold, particularly the freezing of fluids, depend on the action of these frigorific particles. They call them *spiculæ*, or little darts, imagining that this form will explain the acutely painful sensation, and some other effects of intense cold."

This, we believe, is likewise a vulgar opinion, but our author shews that it is totally groundless, and proves, by a very simple induction, that—

"When bodies unequally heated are approached* to one another, it is

* Approach is never, we believe, used as an active verb. It cannot, therefore, have a passive voice.

always the warmer or leſs cold body which acts on the other, and communicates to it a real ſomething which we call heat. Having arrived at this concluſion, it may, perhaps, be required of me, continues the Profeſſor, to expreſs more diſtinctly this ſomething; to give a full deſcription or definition of what I mean by the word *heat* in matter. This, however, is a demand which I cannot ſatisfy entirely."

Nothing ſhort of the modeſty and extreme caution of Dr. Black could have dictated ſuch a confeſſion as this; but modeſty and caution are the inſeparable concomitants of true ſcience. After ſtating the opinions of Bacon, Boyle, Boerhaave, and others, who conſider heat as motion, he obſerves that—

"The greater number of the Engliſh philoſophers ſuppoſed this motion to be in the ſmall particles of the heated bodies, and imagined that it is a rapid tremor, or vibration of theſe particles among one another. Mr. Macquer alſo, and M. Fourcroy, both incline, or did incline, to this opinion. I acknowledge that I cannot form to myſelf a conception of this internal tremor, that has any tendency to explain even the more ſimple effects of heat, or thoſe phænomena which indicate its preſence in a body; and, I think, that Lord Verulam, and his followers, have been contented with very ſlight reſemblances indeed, between thoſe moſt ſimple effects of heat, and the legitimate conſequences of a tremulous motion."

He then mentions more particularly the theory of Boerhaave and other philoſophers, German and French, who conſider heat as conſiſting in the motion, not of the particles of the heated body, but of a ſubtile, highly elaſtic, and penetrating fluid matter diffuſed through the whole univerſe, and pervading with eaſe the denſeſt bodies. Then adverting to the defects of this theory, he adds,

"A more ingenious attempt has lately been made, the firſt outlines of which, ſo far as I know, were given by the late Dr. Cleghorn, in his inaugural diſſertation, publiſhed here (Edinburgh) on the ſubject of heat. He ſuppoſes, that heat depends on the abundance of that ſubtile fluid elaſtic matter, which had been imagined before by other philoſophers to be preſent in every part of the univerſe, and to be the cauſe of heat. But theſe other philoſophers had aſſumed, or ſuppoſed one property only belonging to this ſubtile matter, viz. its great electricity, or the ſtrong repellency of its particles for one another; whereas, Dr. Cleghorn ſuppoſed it poſſeſſed another property alſo, that is, a ſtrong attraction for the particles of the other kinds of matter in nature, which have, in general, more or leſs attraction for one another. He ſuppoſes, that the common groſſer kinds of matter conſiſt of attracting particles, or particles which have a ſtrong attraction for one another, and for the matter of heat; while the ſubtile elaſtic matter of heat is ſelf-repelling matter, the particles of which have a ſtrong repulſion for one another, while they are attracted by the other kinds of matter, and that with different degrees of force."

Had Dr. Black been half ſo ambitious of the fame of a diſcoverer, as ſome of his countrymen, and the French chemiſts in general, are, he might have claimed to himſelf the merit of this theory; for we ſhall ſoon perceive that it reſults naturally from facts which he unqueſtionably

queſtionably diſcovered. Yet he gives it to Dr. Cleghorn, who had been his pupil, becauſe by Dr. Cleghorn it was firſt fully ſtated, and though he conſiders it as the moſt probable idea, which has come to his knowledge, of the nature of heat, he admits it to be altogether a ſuppoſition. Our firſt buſineſs, therefore, as he truly obſerves, is to attend to the effects produced by heat in the bodies to which it is communicated. Theſe, we ſee, are various in the different kinds of matter; but the general effects of heat, eſpecially upon bodies of the more ſimple kind, are EXPANSION, FLUIDITY, VAPOUR, IGNITION, or INCONDESCENCE, and INFLAMMATION, or COMBUSTION. Of theſe he treats in ſeparate ſections, which are, each, divided into ſo many ſubſections, according to the extent and variety of the queſtions which naturally occur in the diſcuſſion.

Under the head of *expanſion* he ſhews, by a few plain facts, that in every form, under which matter appears to us, it is increaſed in its dimenſions by an increaſe of heat, and diminiſhed by cold. Not only air, but water, and even metals are augmented in bulk by heat; and when any metal is made much colder than in its uſual ſtate, a nice meaſurement of its dimenſions ſhews that it has been contracted. There are, however, ſome anomalies in the progreſs of this expanſion in water, and a few other bodies; and there are not, perhaps, two bodies or different kinds of matter, which are expanded by heat in the ſame degree. Hence the defects of the common pendulum clock, and the methods of remedying thoſe defects, which, as well as the ſudden and violent expanſion of water in the inſtant of congelation, are here explained in the moſt perſpicuous terms.

But though heat thus evidently increaſes the bulk of bodies, Dr. Black ſhews from a number of experiments, which with a ſcrupulous rectitude he attributes to their proper authors, that it adds nothing to their weight. This he admits to be a plauſible objection to the theory of heat which he calls Dr. Cleghorn's; but notwithſtanding the difficulty, "I imagine," ſays he, "that, as we proceed, you will find yourſelves more and more impreſſed with the belief that heat is the effect of a peculiar ſubſtance."

The ſubject of expanſion by heat naturally leads him to explain the nature and uſes of the *thermometer*, which he does at ſome length, by giving a hiſtory of the inſtrument, ſhewing the preference of mercury to all other fluids in thermometers for common purpoſes; aſcertaining the degrees of heat which ſuch inſtruments are capable of meaſuring; and pointing out their unavoidable defects as well as their peculiar excellencies. In the courſe of this diſcuſſion many curious experiments, as well as natural phænomena, are mentioned, which evince the great acquiſitions made to our knowledge of the nature of heat by means of the thermometer; though mercury, in extreme degrees of cold, does not contract equably, but by violent ſtarts, indicating a greater diminution of heat than has really taken place. Among other things we learn, by means of this inſtrument, that "all bodies communicating freely with each other, and expoſed

to no inequality of external action, acquire the ſame degree of temperature, as indicated by the thermometer." This was commonly called *the equality of heat* among different bodies, but very improperly, becauſe it confounded the quantity of heat in thoſe bodies with its general ſtrength or intenſity, which are two things perfectly diſtinct. Our author, therefore, calls it the *equilibrium* of heat; and obſerves that it was not well underſtood till he pointed out a method of inveſtigating it.

The illuſtration of that method occupies great part of the ſection, in which it is ſhewn that "the quantities of heat which different kinds of matter muſt receive, to reduce them to an equilibrium with one another, or to raiſe their temperature by an equal number of degrees, are not in proportion to the quantity of matter in each, but in proportions widely different from this, and for which no general principle or reaſon can be aſſigned."

This diſcovery was made by our author in 1760;* and it was ſuggeſted to him by an experiment of Boerhaave's, which ſhews clearly, when rightly underſtood, that "the ſame quantity of the matter of heat (now called *caloric*) has more effect in heating quickſilver than in heating an equal meaſure of water, and therefore that a ſmaller *quantity* of it is ſufficient for increaſing the ſenſible heat of quickſilver by the ſame number of degrees." Quickſilver, therefore, has, in the language of Dr. Black, leſs *capacity* for the matter of heat, than water has. Boerhaave himſelf drew from the experiment, a very different and indeed abſurd inference, in which however he was followed by Muſchenbroeck; but it is here fully proved that not only water and quickſilver, but different bodies of every kind, when they are reduced to the ſame temperature or degree of heat, whatever that be, may contain, though of the ſame ſize or even of the ſame weight, very different quantities of the matter of heat.

"It may here be remarked," ſays the author, "that the diſcoveries which have been made, in this way, are very unfavourable to the opinion of thoſe, who imagine heat to be a tremulous, or other, motion of the particles of matter, communicated from one body to another. If this were true, we muſt admit that the communication would be in conformity with our general experience of the communication of tremulous motion. We are not at liberty to *feign* laws of motion different from thoſe already ad-

---

* We learn from a valuable note by the editor, that "the philoſophers of the continent ſeem agreed in giving the honours of the diſcovery of the unequal diſtribution of heat among bodies of different kinds, to Profeſſor Wilcke of Stockholm, who read a diſſertation on it in the Royal Academy in 1771." Dr. Black's claim to the diſcovery is completely eſtabliſhed in the ſame note, where it is ſhewn that Mr. Watt, the celebrated engineer, and Dr. Irwine, afterwards lecturer in Chemiſtry in the Univerſity of Glaſgow, were the only perſons who had the ſmalleſt pretence to ſhare the honour with him, and that they were then his pupils, making experiments by his direction.

mitted,

mitted, otherwise we can make any supposition account for any phænomenon that we please. The denser substances ought surely to be most powerful in communicating heat to others, or exciting it in them. The fact, however, in a great many examples, and yet not in all, is just the reverse. Such an opinion is therefore totally inconsistent with the phænomena. I do not see how this objection can be evaded."

In treating of the celerity with which heat is communicated from hotter bodies to colder ones, Dr. Black advances an opinion, which his editor controverts, though with that respectful deference which one man of merit never ceases to feel for another, who first planted in his mind the seeds of science. The author maintains, that "for any thing we yet know to the contrary, there is no difference among the different kinds of matter, with respect to the celerity with which heat is disposed to enter into them, or leave them, when the circumstances are exactly the same."

"It must be acknowleged, however," says the editor, "that this proposition is not supported by any very precise experiments, although such are neither abstruse nor difficult. There are even circumstances well known to us, which cannot but have a notable influence on the heating and cooling of bodies. We know that heat is much more speedily communicated to the remoter parts in some bodies than in others, when the heating substance is applied to one extremity of the body. This being the case, it must follow that bodies which conduct heat slowly along their own substance, must also imbibe and emit it slowly, because their superficial parts transmit slowly, what they have received from the heating cause, to the interior parts. The imbibition and emission of heat will also depend, for the same reason, on the conducting power of the heating or cooling medium."

Dr. Robison produces other arguments for his opinion; but to us this alone seems conclusive. The whole note, however, is worthy of perusal, were it only for doing justice in one instance to the memory of our countryman Dr. Hooke, who seems to have anticipated the foreign chemists in almost every discovery for which they most value themselves.

Dr. Black throws out many hints on the communication of heat, which are of the highest importance in the arts of life, especially in those in which much heat and fuel are employed; but we must refer the reader to the work itself, as our limits will not admit of such mention of them all as would even be intelligible. For the same reason we pass over what is here said of the ventilation of mines; of the utility of snow in severe climates; of the waters of deep lakes continuing through winter unfrozen in such climates as our's; and of the tops of the highest mountains being perpetually covered with snow even in the torrid zone. Of all these phænomena, and many others, the most luminous and satisfactory solution is given under the general head of *expansion by heat.*

In the second section, which is entitled OF FLUIDITY, Dr. Black proves, with his usual clearness, that this *form* of matter is always

always the effect of heat. Of courſe, he enters more minutely than he had done in his introduction, into the hypotheſis of *frigorific matter* being the cauſe of congelation, and ſhews that it has not the ſlighteſt ſupport.

"I muſt, however, now add (ſays he) that this account of fluidity, as an effect of heat, is not complete and ſatisfactory, if it be underſtood of the common opinions which were entertained of it. Fluidity was univerſally conſidered as produced by a ſmall addition to the quantity of heat which a body contains, when it is once heated up to its melting point; and the return of ſuch body to a ſolid ſtate, as depending on a very ſmall diminution of the quantity of its heat, after it is cooled to the ſame degree; that a ſolid body, when it is changed into a fluid, receives no greater addition to the heat within it than what is meaſured by the elevation of temperature indicated after fuſion by the thermometer; and that when the melted body is again made to congeal, by a diminution of its heat, it ſuffers no greater loſs of heat than what is indicated alſo by the ſimple application to it of the ſame inſtrument.

"This was the univerſal opinion on this ſubject, ſo far as I know, when I began to read my lectures in the univerſity of Glaſgow, in the year 1757. But I ſoon found reaſon to object to it, as inconſiſtent with many remarkable facts, when attentively conſidered; and I endeavoured to ſhew, that theſe facts are convincing proofs that fluidity is produced by heat in a very different manner."

One of the facts which ſuggeſted to Dr. Black his own theory of liquefaction is the very ſlow progreſs of the melting of ice and ſnow.

"If we attend to the manner in which ice and ſnow melt, when expoſed to the air of a warm room, or when a thaw ſucceeds to froſt, we can eaſily perceive, that however cold they might be at firſt, they are ſoon heated up to the melting point, or begin ſoon at their ſurface to be changed into water. And if the common opinion had been well founded, if the complete change of them into water required only the further addition of a very ſmall quantity of heat, the maſs, though of a conſiderable ſize, ought all to be melted in a very few minutes or ſeconds more, the heat continuing inceſſantly to be communicated from the air around."

But this ſudden liquefaction does not actually happen. The maſſes of ice or ſnow melt with a very ſlow progreſs; and, if they be of a large ſize, often require many weeks of warm weather, before they are totally diſſolved into water.

"It is, therefore, evident that, though the melting ice receives heat very faſt, the only effect of this heat is to change it into water, which is not in the leaſt ſenſibly warmer than the ice was before. A thermometer, applied to the drops or ſmall ſtreams of water, immediately as it comes from the melting ice, will point to the ſame degree as when it is applied to the ice itſelf, or if there be any difference it is too ſmall to deſerve notice. A great quantity, therefore, of the heat, or of the matter of heat, which enters into the melting ice, produces no other effect but to give it fluidity, without augmenting its ſenſible heat: it appears to be abſorbed and concealed within the water, ſo as not to be diſcoverable by the application of the thermometer."

This

This is the *latent heat* of which the discovery placed Dr. Black at the head of philosophical chemists, and which, as might have been expected, foreigners have pretended to discover as well as he.* It is now called *caloric*, and, when considered as the cause of liquefaction, the *caloric of fluidity*; and our author describes some beautiful experiments, by which, in 1761, he not only ascertained the reality of this latent heat in water, but also the quantity of it concealed in water not *sensibly* warmer than ice.

"But some persons may, perhaps, imagine that the heat which thus disappears, does not truly enter into the melting ice, or become combined with that into which it (the ice) is changed. This heat is, perhaps, entirely extinguished and destroyed. As heat has been supposed by some to consist in a rapid motion or tremor of the particles of bodies, or of some subtile matter that is intermixed with them, those who choose to adopt this opinion may imagine that this motion may meet with friction and resistance in the ice, and that a part of it may thus be destroyed, or the moving parts brought to rest."

Our author shews in the most convincing manner, that this supposition, which seems inseparable from the mechanical theory of the formal cause of heat, is inconsistent with many phænomena which attend the freezing of water, while these phænomena strongly support the idea of heat being the effect of a peculiar substance. Thus, water in small quantities, when kept undisturbed, may be cooled to six, seven, or eight degrees below the freezing point, without being frozen. "But, if it be then disturbed, there is a sudden congelation, not of the whole, but of a small part only which is formed into feathers of ice, traversing the water, in every direction, and forming a spongy contexture, which contains the water in its vacuities, so as to give to the whole the appearance of being frozen. But the most remarkable fact is, that while this happens, (and it happens in a moment of time) this mixture of ice and water suddenly becomes warmer, and makes a thermometer immersed in it, rise to the freezing point."

Nothing can be more inconsistent with the old opinions concerning the cause of fluidity than these phænomena. They shew, in the clearest manner, that the heat, which keeps the water fluid, so far from being motion, is let loose by motion when the water, or at least

* As it is one of the greatest discoveries that have been made in science, the French, who allow no merit of any kind but to themselves, might naturally enough endeavour to transfer it from the unassuming author to their own philosophers. We were, however, much surprised by the disingenuous conduct with which Dr. Robison, on this occasion, charges M. de Luc, and of which indeed he seems to have convicted that philosopher; and unless some very satisfactory reply be made to the professor's note (which we must confess appears to us impossible) M. de Luc is likely to sink a little in the public estimation.

part

part of it, inſtantly freezes; they ſhew likewiſe that the loſs of a very little more heat, after the water is cooled down to the freezing point, does not neceſſarily produce congelation, ſince the water may be cooled ſix, ſeven, or eight degrees below that point, without being congealed.

In this ſection the phænomena of liquefaction, congelation, ſoftneſs, ductility, and the annealing of metals are all ſatisfactorily explained by the abſorption or letting looſe of the matter of heat, which is clearly proved to be the real cauſe of fluidity, and of every approach towards it. In the courſe of the diſquiſition the effects of frigorific mixtures are explained, and ſome uſeful inſtructions given for managing them; whilſt no opportunity is let ſlip of pointing out the benefits reſulting to the inhabitants of this globe from the ſlow progreſs of liquefaction and congelation.

"Were the progreſs of liquefaction rapid, as according to the old theory it muſt have been, the conſequences would be dreadful in many caſes. Even as things are at preſent, the melting of great quantities of ſnow and ice occaſions violent torrents, and great inundations in the cold countries, or in the rivers that come from them. But, were the ice and ſnow to melt as ſuddenly as they muſt neceſſarily do, were the former opinion of the action of heat in melting them well-founded, the torrents and inundations would be incomparably more irreſiſtible and dreadful. They would tear up and ſweep away every thing, and that ſo ſuddenly, that mankind ſhould have great difficulty to eſcape from their ravages."

From conſidering the phænomena of fluidity Dr. Black naturally proceed, in the third ſection, to thoſe of *vapour* or *vaporiſation*, which he attributes likewiſe to the matter of heat as their immediate cauſe.

"Suppoſe a ſingle tea-ſpoonful of water to be put into a globe of glaſs, or metal, capable of holding ſome gallons, and ſuppoſe this veſſel exhauſted of air. If we apply heat to the globe, we ſhall perceive the water gradually to diſappear, ſo that preſently the globe ſhall ſeem empty. But the fact is, that it is completely filled with water, now exiſting in the form of a perfectly tranſparent vapour; for if the heat be ſtill farther increaſed, the expanſive force of what now fills the globe will alſo increaſe to ſuch a degree, as even to burſt it.

"It is partly owing to this converſion of water into elaſtic vapour,* that it is ſo dangerous to allow it to come near hot oils. The boiling of lintſeed oil, for example, is always done without doors, to prevent accidents; and we are obliged to chooſe a dry day, becauſe a drop of rain falling among the oil would ſink down through it, and would be ſuddenly converted by the exceſſive heat of the oil, into a great bulk of expanſive vapour, which would daſh the oil out of the veſſel into the fire. In like manner it is

* Our author ſays, "that this vaporiſation of the water is *partly* the cauſe of ſuch accidents, becauſe it is known, of late years, that the water is by this means converted into another expanſive fluid, much more bulky and elaſtic than mere ſteam." The nature of this fluid is conſidered afterwards.

dan-

dangerous to admit water, or even dampneſs, into the moulds in which metals are caſt. In the caſting of iron, they form the moulds of ſand, which being very porous, allows the humidity to eſcape without any violence. When copper is melted in very large maſſes, it contains a prodigious quantity, both of ſenſible and latent heat, which gives it a great power of converting water into expanſive vapour. It has ſometimes happened that a perſon, by careleſsly ſpitting in a copper foundery, has occaſioned an exploſion that deſtroyed the whole building."

The bulk into which water expands by the ordinary boiling heat, was found, by our author and Mr. Watt, to be 1800 times its former bulk. "This change is produced, like fluidity, in conſequence of the heat of the water being increaſed beyond a certain degree; and the vapour collapſes again, as ſoon as its heat is diminiſhed below that degree. This degree, or vaporific point of heat, is found (with reſpect to moſt bodies) to be higher than that which is neceſſary for giving them fluidity. Almoſt every particular kind of matter requires a different temperature for this purpoſe. Hence the chemical terms VOLATILE and FIXED:" thoſe bodies, which are eaſily converted into vapour being called *volatile* to diſtinguiſh them from ſuch as requiring great heat to produce this converſion, are therefore conſidered as *fixed*.

The degree of heat at which any particular kind of matter begins to be converted into elaſtic vapour (and there is probably no kind of matter on which a ſufficient degree of heat would not produce this effect) is different in different circumſtances.

"The vaporific point, therefore, is not ſo unchangeable as the melting point. So far as experience goes, the melting point of each kind of matter is always the ſame; nothing but a certain invariable intenſity of heat can give fluidity to a particular ſolid ſubſtance, nor can any variation of circumſtances hinder that ſolid from becoming fluid, when raiſed to the melting point, and a proper quantity of heat is communicated to it. But the change of a body into vapour is effected by *preſſure* as well as by heat. In proportion as the external preſſure upon its ſurface is greater, it endures a greater heat, without aſſuming the vaporous form, than it would otherwiſe do; and thus we may ſay, that vaporiſation is retarded or oppoſed by external preſſure."

This doctrine is eſtabliſhed and illuſtrated by an account of various experiments, by means of which the author explains the phænomena of ebullition, and ſeveral other phænomena, which, though common, are curious. Thus;

"However long and violently we boil a fluid, we cannot make it in the leaſt hotter than when it began to boil. The thermometer always points at the ſame degree, namely, the vaporific point of that fluid. Hence the vaporific point of fluids is often called their boiling point. When theſe facts and appearances were firſt diſcovered, they ſeemed ſurpriſing, and different opinions were formed with reſpect to the cauſes on which they depend."

Some of theſe opinions are ſtated and ſhewn to be repugnant to all

our

our experience; after which the profeſſor proceeds in the following words:

"A more juſt explanation will occur to any perſon, who will take the trouble to conſider this ſubject with patient attention. In the ordinary manner of heating water, the heating cauſe is applied to the lower parts of the fluid. If the preſſure on the ſurface be not increaſed, the water ſoon acquires the greateſt heat which it can bear, without aſſuming the form of vapour. Subſequent additions of heat, therefore, in the ſame inſtant in which they enter the water, muſt convert into vapour that part which they affect. As theſe additions of heat all enter at the bottom of the fluid, there is a conſtant production of elaſtic vapour there, which, on account of its weighing almoſt nothing, muſt riſe through the ſurrounding water, and appear to be thrown up to the ſurface with violence, and from thence it is diffuſed through the air. The water is thus gradually waſted, as the boiling continues, but its temperature is never increaſed, at leaſt in that part which remains after long continued and violent boiling. The parts, indeed, in contact with the bottom of the veſſel may be ſuppoſed to have received a little more heat, but this is inſtantly communicated to the ſurrounding water through which the elaſtic vapour riſes.

This has the appearance of being a ſimple, plain, and complete account of the production of vapour, and of the boiling of fluids; and it is the only account that was given of this ſubject before I began to deliver theſe lectures: but I am perſuaded that it is by no means a full account of the matter. According to this account, and the notion that was conceived of the fermentation of vapour, it was taken for granted that, after a body is heated up to its vaporific point, nothing further is neceſſary but the addition of a little more heat to change it into vapour. It was alſo ſuppoſed, on the other hand, that where the vapour of water is ſo far cooled as to be ready for condenſation, this condenſation, or return into the ſtate of water, will happen at once, or in conſequence only of its loſing a very ſmall quantity of heat."

Dr. Black, however, ſhews, in the ſame manner as in the caſe of fluidity, that a very great quantity of heat is neceſſary to the production of vapour, although the body be already heated to that temperature which it cannot paſs, by the ſmalleſt degree, without being ſo converted. The undeniable conſequence of this ſhould be, an exploſion of the whole water, with a violence equal to that of gunpowder. But he ſhews that this great quantity of heat enters into the vapour gradually, while it is forming, without making it perceptibly hotter to the thermometer. The vapour, when examined by that inſtrument, is found to be exactly of the ſame temperature as the boiling water from which it aroſe. The water muſt be raiſed to a certain temperature, becauſe, at that temperature only, is it diſpoſed to abſorb heat; and it is not inſtantly exploded, becauſe, in that inſtant, there cannot be had a ſufficient ſupply of heat through the whole maſs. He ſhews, likewiſe, that when the vapour of water is condenſed into a liquid, and the very ſame great quantity of heat, that raiſed it to vapour, comes out of it into the colder matter by which it is condenſed; the water, into which the vapour is changed,

does

does not become sensibly colder by the loss of this great quantity of heat. It does not become colder in proportion to the quantity of heat obtainable from it during its condensation.

All these facts are the unquestionable discoveries of our author, and the experiments are here perspicuously detailed by which he and his pupils Mr. Watt and Dr. Irwine established them. From the experiments of Mr. Watt, which seem to have been made with the greatest accuracy, it is apparent that in the steam of water there are from 900 to 950 degrees of heat LATENT under the ordinary pressure of the atmosphere: the experiments of Lavoisier give a somewhat higher value of this latent heat, making it 1000 degrees, or perhaps a little more.

"I flatter myself, therefore," says Dr. Black, "that we may now take it as a point fully established, that, *when a fluid body is raised to its boiling temperature, by the continual and copious application of heat, its particles suddenly attract to themselves a great quantity of heat, and, by this combination, their mutual relation is so changed, that they no longer attract each other, gathering into drops and forming a liquid, but avoid each other, separating to at least ten times their former distance, (for a cubic inch of water forms much more than a thousand cubic inches of vapour), and would separate much farther, were they not compressed by the weight of the atmosphere; and, in short, they now compose a fluid, elastic and expansive, like air.*"

Our author next makes various reflections on this important fact applicable to the arts of life. He explains, with his usual perspicuity, the principles of steam-cookery, and of the steam-engine; but he does not pretend to explain the *manner* in which the matter of heat is combined with that of water, in order to form the vapour called steam.

"Many have been the speculations and views of ingenious men about this union of bodies with heat. But as they are all hypothetical, and as the hypothesis is of the most complicated nature, being in fact a hypothetical application of another hypothesis, I cannot hope for much useful information by attending to it. A nice adaptation of conditions will make almost any hypothesis agree with the phænomena. This will please the imagination, but does not advance our knowledge. I therefore avoid such speculations, as taking up time which may be better employed in learning more of the general laws of chemical operations. I content myself with saying, that in liquefaction and vaporisation, water absorbs a great quantity of heat, because this expression immediately raises the motion of a sudden, and somewhat copious, accumulation of heat. And I say, that this great quantity of accumulated heat is *latent* in the water, or in the vapour, merely because the thermometer, our usual test, does not give us any indication of its presence; of which presence we are not allowed to doubt, when we see the same quantity emerge again, in its usual thermometrical activity, when the water freezes, or the vapour collapses. Without saying that I have any clear conception of the union between bodies and heat, I am well entitled by the phænomena, to say, that this vaporous combination differs in some peculiar manner from that which merely produces expansion. And, because I find that vapour cannot exist without this latent

tent heat, any more than aquafortis can exiſt without nitrous acid, I conſider latent heat as conſtituting a part of aqueous vapour."

Dr. Black having obſerved that ſome ſolid ſubſtances are more eaſily converted by heat into vapours than into liquids, and that when theſe vapours are condenſed, they become again ſolids and not liquids, briefly explains the terms *evaporation*, *diſtillation*, and *ſublimation*. This explanation enables him to ſhew, in the moſt perſpicuous and convincing manner, why heat changes the properties and appearance of ſome bodies entirely, converting them as it were into new ſubſtances. He then proceeds to enquire whether the effects of heat, which he has aſcertained in ſo many bodies, may be ſuppoſed univerſal, ſo as that every body by a ſufficient intenſity of heat, could we procure it, would be converted into vapour; and every palpable, elaſtic fluid, could it be wholly deprived of heat, into a ſolid ſubſtance. He is too faithful a follower of Bacon to give a dogmatical anſwer to theſe inquiries; but he admits the probability that the moſt fixed bodies might be volatilized by heat, and the moſt elaſtic fluids condenſed by cold.

"In the modern doctrines of chemiſtry, therefore, it is now conſidered as an indubitable truth, that the air has its rare and elaſtic form from the heat it contains; and it is aſſumed as an eſtabliſhed principle, that all other permanently elaſtic fluids derive their elaſtic vaporous form from the ſame cauſe; that each of them is a compound of a peculiar matter, and of the matter of heat, united in the ſtate of latent heat, (or caloric, as it is named by the French chemiſts) with the other matter, ſo as to conſtitute with it an elaſtic fluid or vapour."

We have next ſome intereſting obſervations on that proceſs of nature by which miſts, and fogs, and clouds are formed. This Dr. Black calls *natural evaporation*, and ſhews that it differs in many particulars from that evaporation which we *know* to be produced *wholly* by heat. He ſtates, therefore, the opinions of various philoſophers reſpecting the cauſe of natural evaporation; but ſeems inclined himſelf to attribute it to heat alone. Dr. Robiſon thinks differently.

"If heat, (ſays he,) be the ſole agent in producing the vapour, I cannot ſee how the air above the evaporating body can be uniformly tranſparent. Although the vapour may have the ſame elaſticity with the air, it is very improbable that it has either the ſame weight, or the ſame refracting power, and it muſt always ſurround the evaporating body with an unequable atmoſphere, like a mixture of oil and water ſhaken together. The neceſſity of renewal of air, the ſtop to evaporation by ſtagnation, and even the effect of extended ſurface, are all inexplicable, if heat alone be the agent. Theſe facts are ſtrong arguments for believing that the air *alſo* acts by its diſſolving power."

But if heat be the cauſe of the vaporous form even of the air itſelf, may it not properly be conſidered, notwithſtanding theſe facts, as the ſole agent in natural evaporation? There is certainly a great quantity of heat abſorbed in the proceſs of ſpontaneous evaporation; inſomuch

inſomuch that artificial ice may be produced by it even in very warm climates. Though no ice is ever formed at Benares on the pools or other ſmall collections of water, yet, when the thermometer falls to within eight degrees of the freezing point, the natives ſucceed in procuring it by the following proceſs:

"Shallow pits or beds are made four or five feet wide, and about four inches deep, ſeparated from one another by narrow borders, and ſo numerous as to cover an extent of about four acres. Theſe pits are filled with dry ſtraw in the proper ſeaſon, and on the ſtraw are placed rows cloſe together, of ſhallow earthen pans, into which a few inches depth of water are put every evening of the winter ſeaſon, when the weather is clear, and the nights very cool. In the morning they find more or leſs ice in the pans, which is taken out before ſun riſe, or about five o'clock; and that it may ſeparate the more eaſily from the earthen veſſels, the inſide of theſe is rubbed with a little butter before the water is put into them. The clear and cold weather, which is neceſſary to the production of ice by this proceſs, is undoubtedly attended with a northerly wind. And in ſuch a country the northerly winds, or breezes, are exceſſively dry, in conſequence of their coming over a great extent of a dry northern continent. They have therefore, great power to promote evaporation. The ſhallow earthen veſſels, expoſed in this manner, and the water in them, muſt become colder by a quicker than ordinary evaporation of a part of the water, than any other matter around them; and care is taken, by the contrivance of the proceſs, to prevent the coldneſs of the veſſel and water from being too much diminiſhed by communication with the warm ſoil that is below."

It is this cold produced by evaporation that makes the tropical regions habitable, and even not uncomfortable habitations to thoſe who perſpire freely.

"There is in the body itſelf a continual laboratory, or manufacture of heat, and were the ſurrounding air of ſuch a temperature as not to carry it off, it would ſoon accumulate ſo as to deſtroy life. The exceſſive perſpiration, ſupplyed by diluting draughts, performs the ſame office as the cold air without the tropics, in guarding us from this fatal accumulation. It is not unlikely that that conſtitution of the veſſels of the lungs, and the pores of the ſkin, which unfits them for bringing forward the lymph, in ſufficient quantity for carrying off, by evaporation, the heat generated by the vital functions, is the immediate cauſe of the heat in ordinary fevers."

In ſection 5th Dr. Black treats of *ignition* or *incondeſcence*; and we think that ſtronger objections might be urged to ſome of his reaſonings on this ſubject, than to any other part of his work, which we have yet examined. He ſeems to think the matter of heat and the matter of light, the very ſame ſubſtance; and ſays expreſsly that

"Ignition, or a glow of light, may be conſidered as one of thoſe effects of heat that is produced in the moſt ſimilar manner, upon different bodies, of any kind whatever. It is alſo a very general effect of heat. We do not know of any bodies that are exempted from it, unleſs it be thoſe whoſe volatility is ſo great, that they cannot be made to endure the degree of heat neceſſary for this effect. But even theſe, when in the form of vapour,

may, perhaps, be heated red hot, though many of them muſt be ſo very greatly expanded before it acquire the neceſſary degree, that it would not be eaſy to perceive whether or not they are in a ſtate of ignition."

But, as the editor obſerves, the identity of the matter of heat and light has always been admitted with great heſitation.

"Dr. Hooke exhibited, at a meeting of the Royal Society in 1682, an experiment, in which it appeared that a mirror of foiled glaſs reflected the heat of a fire very feebly, although it reflected the light with great brilliancy. Mr. Scheele ſhewed that a plate of clear glaſs, held between the face and a glowing fire, interrupted for a while the whole heat, but it tranſmitted the light without ſenſible diminution; and Dr. Herſchel has ſhewn, in the moſt convincing manner, the complete ſeparability of light and a determinate portion of heat, by means of a difference in their refrangibility."

We are fully aware of the reply which is ſometimes made to the inference drawn from the experiments of Hooke, Scheele, and Herſchel. It is ſaid that the matter of heat and light is the ſame, but that the former moves with leſs velocity and is leſs refrangible than the latter, and that there is no other difference between the atoms of the one and the atoms of the other. But what other difference than this would the objector require to deſtroy the identity of light and heat? or how can one body differ more from another than by differing in all the qualities which we know them to poſſeſs? Heat moves with leſs velocity than light*; its rays are leſs refrangible; it is not always reflected by the ſame ſubſtance; it excites in us ſenſations very different from thoſe excited by light; it produces expanſion, fluidity, and vapour, which there is no evidence that mere light does; and it forces its way through bodies impermeable to light. Gold does not differ more than this from lead or from platinum.

The argument from Dr. Darwin's experiment, which we once heard an itinerant lecturer triumphantly urge in ſupport of the identity of light and heat, is here ſhewn, by Dr. Robiſon, to have no force.

"Dr. Darwin directed a ſtream of air through a ſmall aperture of a tube intenſely heated, into a box, which had an optical apparatus in the oppoſite ſide, by which he could ſee any light at the point of the pipe with great advantage. Having ſtaid ſome time in the dark, to render his eye very ſenſible to light, he looked in, and cauſed the injection of heated air to be made; but he could not perceive the ſmalleſt light. He then placed a ſlender bit of gold at the diſtance of half an inch from the hole. When the heated air was again injected, the gold acquired a very bright glow in a few ſeconds, although the heating air was altogether inviſible. Dr. Herſchel's curious obſervations ſhew us that, by a proper optical apparatus, a body may be intenſely heated by the rays of the ſun, without being at all illuminated; and it ſeems to require an experiment like Dr. Dar-

* This, however, is a gratuitous aſſertion, and probably falſe. Rev.

win's

win's to decide whether this heat would cauſe it to emit light. Alſo, ſeeing that it is affirmed by the French Chemiſts that oxygenous gas is the ſole ſource of the heat and light which appear in combuſtion, it would ſeem to be doubtful whether Dr. Darwin would have ſeen the gold ignited had it been heated by a ſtream of azotic gas inſtead of common air."

Even if he had ſeen this it would not neceſſarily follow either that azotic gas is capable of ignition, or that light and heat are the ſame ſubſtances. The only inference that could be fairly drawn from ſuch a phænomenon, would be that oxygenous gaz is not the *ſole* ſource of the light and heat which appear in combuſtion, and that the French theory is radically wrong, as it is known to be defective.

In the courſe of his enquiries concerning ignition, Dr. Black explains the phænomena of Wedgewood's thermometer, and endeavours to reconcile the contraction of pure clay with the general doctrine of expanſion by heat. On this ſubject there is a valuable note by the editor; but we muſt paſs on to the ſection which treats of *inflammation*, the moſt intereſting, perhaps, of all the phænomena which have attracted the attention of chemiſts.

Our author begins his obſervations on this phænomenon with ſtating accurately the characteriſtic properties of inflammable bodies. He then enquires from what theſe properties reſult; and this leads him to give an inſtructive hiſtory of the *phlogiſton* of the chemiſts. During this detail it is ſhewn by Dr. Robiſon that the green colour of the leaves of plants is produced wholly by the rays of the ſun; and by Dr. Black, that the colouring matter, which may be eaſily ſeparated from the plant, is exceedingly inflammable. The editor laying hold of this circumſtance; and obſerving from Herſchel's and Wollaſton's late diſcoveries, that there are rays of the ſun which illuminate, rays which warm without illuminating, and rays which affect bodies chemically, without producing either light or heat, adds that "if this laſt diſcovered principle ſhall be found neceſſary to combuſtion, it may very well be called *the phlogiſton*, in whatever way it contributes to the effect." It is not, however, the phlogiſton of Becher and Stahl, which Dr. Black proves to have been wholly a creature of the imagination; and which, after all the modifications it had undergone in the hands of the later chemiſts, he abandons in favour of the more rational theory of Lavoiſier. As that theory is known to every man at preſent, who is in any degree intereſted in chemical purſuits, we hold it needleſs to detail it here; though it is proper to inform the reader that Dr. Robiſon ſeems to have proved completely, that "it was ſeen in all its extent and importance, by Dr Robert Hooke, one of the greateſt geniuſes, and moſt ardent inquirers into the operations of nature, who figured during the latter half of the ſeventeenth century,—a period of great diſcoveries." We do not by this mean to inſinuate, nor does the profeſſor inſinuate, that Lavoiſier borrowed or ſtole his theory from Hooke, whoſe *Micrographia* and *Lampas* he had probably never ſeen. In the con-

ſtruction of that theory, however, the French philoſopher appears to have been much indebted to Dr. Black, whoſe modeſt claims we ſhall ſtate in his own words.

"I cannot explain to you at preſent the whole of this theory, or trace the ſteps by which it has been brought to its preſent ſtate. We ſhall have better opportunities for doing this in other parts of the courſe, as you will have by that time become well acquainted with ſeveral ſubſtances, whoſe properties have a great influence in producing the phænomena which furniſh the chief arguments in ſupport of the theory. I can only remark juſt now, that it is founded on a very great number of experiments and diſcoveries which have been made within theſe twenty years (1789) on the nature and qualities of atmoſpherical air, and of a number of other elaſtic fluids.

"Ingenious men in different parts of Europe, incited by the remarkable properties which I had diſcovered in one of thoſe fluids in 1756, began to employ themſelves in ſuch experiments, and they have made many aſtoniſhing and moſt intereſting diſcoveries. The fundamental experiments were firſt made, and the leading inferences were firſt drawn in this country by Dr. Prieſtley, the Hon. Mr. Cavendiſh, and my friend Mr. Watt. But it was chiefly in France that they were repeated, with proper attention to all the circumſtances that could effect the reſult, and this reſult was made the foundation of a new theory of combuſtion. Theſe experiments have been made there with extraordinary ingenuity and accuracy, and on ſo large a ſcale, that the effects produced were the more clearly and fully perceived. The unfortunate Lavoiſier, who fell a ſacrifice to the ambition of his philoſophic aſſociates, and whoſe unjuſt and cruel fate, and the loſs which ſcience has ſuffered by it, cannot be too much deplored, was the moſt active in this inquiry, ſparing neither labour nor expence. His own exertions diſplay the greateſt ingenuity. He alſo employed the talents of other eminent philoſophers in aſcertaining ſome of the moſt important and intereſting facts; but Lavoiſier himſelf was the principal author of the new theory.

"It had long before been known that air, and even a conſtant ſupply of freſh air, is neceſſary to inflammation; that if a burning body be ſhut up with a certain moderate quantity only of air, the inflammation ſtops after ſome time, although the inflammability of the body be not exhauſted. The incloſed air has undergone a change which makes it totally unfit for continuing the inflammation. In ſome of the experiments made by Dr. Hales, and other perſons, it had alſo appeared, that the air is generally diminiſhed on this occaſion, or, in the language of Dr. Hales, a part of it is abſorbed. But this has been aſcertained with much more preciſion, and in a much greater number of caſes, by the later experiments. It has become clear and evident, by many of theſe, that a conſiderable quantity of air is really abſorbed, and combined with the matter of the burning body, ſo as to form, in many caſes, a denſe compound, in which the air ſo abſorbed is totally deprived of its uſual form of an elaſtic fluid; and the additional weight which the matter of the burning body acquires, has been found to correſpond exactly to the weight of the air which has been abſorbed by it.

"Farther, the two very different combinations of heat, which I had diſcovered, in which it produces fluidity and vapour, encouraged M. Lavoiſier

fier to presume that there was another combination, which produced a permanently elastic fluid, not decompoundable, like a liquid, or a vapour, by the touch of a colder body*; and the different capacities for heat having been already discovered, it appeared no difficulty to account for the vast quantities set loose in combustion. This new theory, therefore, is founded on the doctrine of *latent heat*, and is indeed an *extension of it.*"

Hence, as we have been credibly informed, Lavoisier, before he was intoxicated by the fame of system building, was wont to call Dr. Black the father of the science of chemistry; and hence has he been called by others the Newton of that science.

*(To be continued.)*

---

*The Church of England vindicated from misrepresentation; shewing her genuine Doctrines as contained in her Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies. With a particular reference to the Elements of the Christian Theology, by the Bishop of Lincoln.* By a Presbyter of the Church of England. Large 8vo. Pp. 162. 3s. Mawman. 1801.

WE have here another "regular Minister of the establishment," of the right and genuine evangelical stamp; a worthy fellow labourer with the great Mr. Overton in the righteous cause of Calvinistic Methodism; and equally assiduous with that illustrious champion, "spargere voces in vulgum ambiguas, et quærere conscius arma." They are indeed "par nobile fratrum," animated with the same holy zeal, and endowed with nearly the same portion of candour, veracity, and fair impartiality. The size, it is true, of this publication is far inferior to that of Mr. Overton's; but the author of it may, notwithstanding, be possessed of much real merit, and entitled to much praise. In estimating the value of any man's exertions, we ought always to consider the precise object which he had in view, and the success with which he has ultimately accomplished it. The feeble pop of a small pocket pistol makes, in point of noise, but a sorry figure when compared with the loud and deafening report of a mighty cannon. But he who points the former may kill his man, while he who fires the latter may miss his mark. We would not, by any means, be understood as if, by this observation, we wish to detract, in the smallest degree, from that well-earned fame which Mr. Overton enjoys, and will, we doubt not, long continue to enjoy, among the sainted society of the "True Churchmen." Our readers, we trust, will do us the justice to acknowledge that we have taken considerable pains to shew how well he has deserved it. But Mr. Overton was engaged, by his own account, with

---

* This is not strictly true, for the oxygenated muriatic acid gas is condensed by a cold—32° of Farenheit. Edit.

a legion of aſſailants, and, of courſe, required artillery of a large calibre. The efforts of Preſbyter are chiefly directed againſt a ſingle antagoniſt; and we queſtion not but that, in his own opinion, and in that of his party, his victory over the Biſhop of Lincoln is as complete as that of Mr. Overton over his numerous and formidable foes; as complete, indeed, as was ever obtained in the field of controverſy.

The ground taken poſſeſſion of by this anonymous writer is the ſame which was occupied by the author of "The True Churchmen aſcertained." He obſerves that "the Church of England, in forming her eſtabliſhment, has explicitly declared her own faith in her Articles, and transferred it into her Liturgy," (p. 32), or, as he expreſſes himſelf in another place, that ſhe "has explicitly declared her faith in her *articles of religion*, has more fully explained them in her *homilies*, and formed in correſpondence therewith her *liturgical ſervices*. (P. 3.) He contends that the Articles are "only capable of a Calviniſtic ſenſe," (p. 29.) meaning, we preſume, that they are not capable of any other ſenſe; that the framers or compilers of them "formed them with the expreſs view of maintaining uniformity of opinion in the Church;" (p. 117;) and "that their opinions were uniformly, clearly, and definitively CALVINISTIC." (P. 118.) He, therefore, appeals "to every man of candor, of reſearch, and unbiaſſed integrity, if, on *the whole*, the evidence is not the moſt concluſive and irrefragable; that the Articles of the Church of England are NOT, as the Biſhop endeavours to prove, *Anti-Calviniſtic*, but are uniformly and conſiſtently Calviniſtic, and can never be admitted in any other ſenſe by any man who, in ſubſcribing them, would preſerve a good conſcience." (Ibid.)

The evidence on this very important ſubject, into a pretty full and minute examination of which we ſo lately entered, it will not be expected that we ſhould now repeat. The principle, indeed, which is not only admitted, but contended for, both by Mr. Overton and Preſbyter, is completely deciſive, we conceive of the diſpute. For, "where uniformity is the profeſſed deſign of the compilers, and to avoid diverſity of opinion the expreſs object, it would be abſurd to ſuppoſe that the form of prayer drawn up for general uſe, ſhould not exactly correſpond with the doctrinal truths laid down in the Articles, as the baſis of faith and hope." (P. 119.) Availing ourſelves of this acknowledged principle, a fairer or better founded than which it is impoſſible either to imagine or deſire, for "contradictions," as our author well obſerves, "are inadmiſſible," (p. 35,) we have the vanity to think that, in the judgment of every unbiaſſed mind, we ſhall be deemed to have determined the controverſy; and that future writers on the Calviniſtic ſide will find it impracticable to charge their doctrines on the Church of England, without directly accuſing her of glaring, manifeſt, and ſhameful inconſiſtency.

It is ſomewhat remarkable, and much to be regretted, that neither this writer nor Mr. Overton has favoured the public with a connected

and

and comprehenſive view of their ſyſtem of Calviniſm; for although the word is perpetually in their mouths, they have no where told us what they mean preciſely and exactly by the thing. Mr. Overton, indeed, pretends to diſclaim certain doctrines which have always, we believe, been conſidered as conſtituting the very eſſence and marrow of the Calviniſtic ſcheme. The ſame conduct has been adopted by Preſbyter, and, we doubt not, with the very ſame deſign. The object of both was clearly to diminiſh, as much as they could, that abhorrence which ſome of the tenets of Calvin muſt ever excite in the boſom of a ſenſible, benevolent man. Our author, however, has, in two different places, preſented us with a ſketch, not indeed of Calviniſm, but, as we ſuppoſe of Anti-Calviniſm; from which ſketch we may, by the rule of contraries, pretty accurately gueſs what his Calviniſm is. "Whilſt the lifeleſs, impotent, and unſcriptural ſyſtem is inculcated, of man's ſpontaneous ability to think, or do any thing that is good, of the freedom of the human will alike to good as to evil; of the equal redemption of every individual; and the price of atonement, by the blood of Chriſt, as much ſhed for thoſe who periſh as for thoſe who are ſaved; and the falſe hope inculcated of univerſal ſalvation, to Jew, Turk, and Infidel, if he be ſincere in his own religion; and that the merits of Chriſt will NO LESS extend to them, than to the Chriſtian believer: where ſuch ſentiments are taught it is impoſſible that any ſcripturally moral change ſhould ever be produced in the tempers or manners of men." (P. 13.) From this, we apprehend it may be, with ſufficient certainty inferred that, according to our author's Calviniſm, "man is utterly devoid of ability to think or do any thing which is good; that the human will is free only to do evil; that Chriſt died to ſave but a few individuals; and that all who are not Calviniſtic Methodiſts will infallibly be damned." We have no inclination, as we certainly have no right to call our author to account for embracing any ſyſtem of belief which he chooſes; but he muſt excuſe us if we expreſs our ſurpriſe at the epithets affixed by him to the creed which he here aſcribes to his antagoniſt. If this creed be "lifeleſs, impotent, and unſcriptural," his own muſt be "life-giving, powerful, and ſcriptural." Now, we have not, we confeſs, ſagacity to perceive how a ſyſtem can be conſidered as *conferring life*, which inevitably conſigns the miſerable majority of human kind to *eternal death*; how that ſcheme of doctrine can be ſaid to be *powerful* which annihilates all power but the power of doing evil; or how thoſe opinions can poſſibly be *ſcriptural*, which *contradict* the whole voice and tenor of ſcripture, from the beginning of Geneſis to the end of the Apocalypſe. The other paſſage is to the ſame purpoſe, and conceived as follows: "Many have of late ariſen in avowed oppoſition to the faith once embraced by our forefathers, and undertaken to prove that the Church of England, in her Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies, ſo far from ſpeaking the language, or enforcing the doctrines called *Calviniſtic*, abhors and rejects them; that the Articles are only conſiſtent and intelligible [are conſiſtent

and intelligible only] when interpreted in the ſenſe given by Arminius and Epiſcopius; and that were a ſecond ſynod at Dort to be aſſembled, every former deciſion muſt be reverſed; the equal ſalvability of all men be admitted, the ſame ſufficiency of grace beſtowed on thoſe that periſh as on thoſe that are ſaved; the blood of Chriſt as really ſhed for thoſe who are in hell as in heaven; and every Jew, Turk, and Heathen, if he is ſincerely deſirous to conform his conduct to his own rule of morals, in as ſalvable an eſtate as any Chriſtian." (Pp. 34, 35.)

To ſuch of our readers as may have an opportunity of peruſing his book, our evangelical Preſbyter may, perhaps, not appear to have been very fortunate in the ſelection of his arguments to prove the grand point of the Calviniſm of the Church of England, but we venture to aſſure them that, in this reſpect, no blame attaches to him; for we are perſuaded that he has employed as good as are any where to be found; and they would not demand, from the ableſt advocate, the performance of impoſſibilities. In the mean time, it is but juſtice to obſerve that there are two kinds of proof in the management and application of which he is as dextrous and happy as the moſt approved Calviniſtic controverſialiſt. Theſe modes of proof, which are of very ancient uſe, conſiſt in the confidence of unſupported aſſertion, and in the ſubtlety of ſly inſinuation. Of theſe it will be proper to produce ſome ſpecimens; and they are ſuch as, in our opinion, would do honour to the moſt daring diſputant that ever undertook a deſperate cauſe.

"The writings of all the firſt reformers, (ſays this dauntleſs combatant), exhibit one uniform tenor of doctrine, confirmed by the ſuffrage of both univerſities, and remaining for the firſt hundred years or more, after the reformation, unimpeached; nor dared any man, in that age, without immediate cenſure, queſtion whether the Articles ſubſcribed were not, in their literal and grammatical ſenſe, what is called Calviniſtic, and for this I appeal to the whole current of our Church hiſtory and its reformers." (P. 3.)

Again—"Had your Lordſhip lived with Ridley, Hooper, Latimer, or Cranmer, could you have maintained the Articles in the ſenſe they held them, or gone to the ſtake in the maintenance of them? Had your Lordſhip been called to Lambeth, muſt you not have marked with abhorrence, the *articles* drawn up *there* by your epiſcopal brethren? Had you been a deputy, with the excellent Hall and Ward, at the ſynod of Dort, you muſt have defended Epiſcopius and the Remonſtrants, and been ſmitten with the ſame condemnation. Of this ſort your Lordſhip knows I could multiply ſtriking facts; and call upon you to produce from the glorious company of our reformers, martyrs, and confeſſors in the Church of England, an individual of eminence, who did not hold the Articles in the Calviniſtic ſenſe; of which I cannot find a doubt entertained, till Laud, that cruel bigot and fierce Anti-Calviniſt, fought to promote that change of ſentiment, which hath ſince made ſo rapid a progreſs." (Pp. 9, 10, 11.)

But alas! "That which, for the firſt hundred years after the reformation, had been received as the undiſputed doctrine, is now become

come little ſhort of hereſy, and treated as a ground of marked reproach and oppoſition. To maintain that the Articles of the Church of England, and the Liturgy ſpeak, in conformity with *all* the other reformed churches, the doctrine uſually termed Calviniſtic is, by the Biſhop of Lincoln and a great majority of the clergy, not only denied but execrated." (P. 32.) The cauſes and conſequences of ſo lamentable a degeneracy, it is, ſurely, important to aſcertain; and here they follow: "We may eaſily trace the departure from the faith once delivered to the ſaints through the mazes of this world's politics, earthly-mindedneſs, and that careleſsneſs and inattention to eternal things, which is [are] carrying us rapidly forward to infidelity, deiſm, and practical atheiſm: for when conſcience is violated by the abuſe of the moſt ſolemn ſubſcriptions, and the unmeaning routine of prayers uttered without any heart-felt ſenſation of their import or the ſpirit of prayer, what can have a more direct tendency than theſe things to harden the conſcience into inſenſibility, and to deſtroy every principle of real religion?" Pp. 32, 33.)

Theſe are brilliant and pathetic paſſages, no doubt; but we cannot, we confeſs, ſufficiently admire the unbluſhing front of impudent falſhood which they all diſplay. If this pious Preſbyter did not know that almoſt every one of the aſſertions and inſinuations here advanced is directly contrary to truth and fact, he was evidently unqualified to write on the ſubject; and if, on the other hand, he did know this, he has ſhewn his unqueſtionable title to a character which we do not chooſe particularly to delineate. Now although, for deciding "the matter at iſſue, whether the Church of England is *Calviniſtic* or *Anti-Calviniſtic*," (p. 9,) it is of little conſequence what were the private opinions of our reformers; becauſe the queſtion is, not what the reformers privately thought, but what our doctrinal ſtandards publicly teach; yet when this ſhameleſs writer repeatedly affirms that, for the firſt hundred years after the reformation, Calviniſm was received as their unimpeached and undiſputed ſenſe, it is, we think, impoſſible to ſuppoſe him ignorant that his affirmation is contradicted by numerous and authentic facts. But if he chooſe to hazard a general aſſertion, hoping that, with many, it might paſs unchallenged, it is wonderful that he could be ſo much off his guard as flatly to contradict himſelf. He has not, indeed, informed us in what year the reformation, according to his chronology, began; but he allows that, at leaſt, "the cruel bigot Laud" was "a fierce *Anti-Calviniſt*;" and he muſt ſurely carry the commencement of the reformation conſiderably higher than is generally done; if this lamented victim of Calviniſtic vengeance was poſterior to that event by a century. From the manner in which he ſpeaks of the Lambeth Articles, would not any one ſuppoſe that theſe precious articles had been authoritatively received, as containing the ſubſtance, or, at leaſt, an explanation of the doctrine of the Church of England? The fact is, however, directly otherwiſe. The troubleſome and factious junto, it is true, who firſt drew them up were pragmatical enough, agreeably to the known ſpirit of the party, to teize and harraſs the Archbiſhop Whitgift, in order to get them

them ſanctioned; but, inſtead of being able to gain their end, the iſſue was that, as Collier informs us, the articles were ſo effectually ſuppreſſed that a copy of them was not to be met with for ſome time after. We know that the ſame reſtleſs party again exerted themſelves in an effort, at the Hampton-Court conference, to have theſe articles publicly recogniſed; but they were again refuſed. Conſidering, indeed, the nature of the Lambeth Articles, we are much miſtaken if the Biſhop of Lincoln will regard as injurious, our author's ſuppoſition, that had his Lordſhip been then at the head of the Church, (a ſtation on which he would confer greater honour than he could derive from it,) he "muſt have marked theſe articles with abhorrence." His Lordſhip, we believe, would have as little regarded the anathemas of the ſynod of Dort. He might, perhaps, have been even perverſe enough to pride himſelf in being "ſmitten with the ſame condemnation" in which Epiſcopius and the Remonſtrants were involved. But whether, in our judgment of the Biſhop's ſentiments, we are right or wrong, it is ſufficient for our preſent purpoſe to obſerve that the canons of that packed and fanatical ſynod were never adopted by the Church of England, and are of no more authority in determining her doctrines than the canons of the councils of Conſtance or of Trent.

This author has inſerted in the liſt of his party the venerable names of Ridley and Hooper, of Latimer and Cranmer, our moſt eminent reformers; and this he has done with ſuch coolneſs and confidence, that the uninformed part of his readers muſt be greatly ſurprized when told that the juſtice of his claim has ever been denied, or even been conſidered as a ſubject of diſpute. This may, perhaps, be eſteemed good policy: but to us it appears to be the *ne plus ultra* of diſingenuouſneſs. Of Cranmer we are ſure that when he wrote or approved of "the Erudition of a Chriſtian Man," his opinions on the highly important points of grace, free-will, and univerſal redemption, were totally inconſiſtent with the dogmas of Calvin. Mr. Overton, indeed, has objected to the evidence of that publication, becauſe, as he alleges, the minds of Cranmer and of his aſſociates, were not yet diſentangled from the errors of popery, and were only "advancing to the perfection of truth." But if Cranmer was, as he is ſaid to have been, the author of the excellent homily on ſalvation, he was no more a Calviniſt in 1552, when the Articles and Liturgy were eſtabliſhed by authority, than he was about the year 1540, when he publiſhed "The Erudition of a Chriſtian Man." The ſentiments of Ridley are equally well-known to have been Anti-Calviniſtic. With regard to Hooper, the preface to his Expoſition of the Ten Commandments bears moſt ſplendid teſtimony againſt arbitrary decrees, and in favour of the doctrine of univerſal redemption; a doctrine which overturns, from the very foundation, the whole ſyſtem of Calvin. "As far (ſays he), as extendeth the virtue and ſtrength of God's promiſe to ſave men, as the rigour and juſtice of the law for ſin to damn men; for as, by the ſin and offence of one man, death was extended and made common unto all men unto condemnation, ſo by the juſtice of one man is de-

rived

rived life unto *all men* unto juſtification. The promiſe of grace appertaineth *unto every ſort of men in the world*, and comprehendeth them all; howbeit, within certain limits and bounds, the which if men neglect or paſs over, *they exclude themſelves* from the promiſe in Chriſt: as Cain was no more excluded, till he excluded himſelf, than Abel; Saul than David; Judas than Peter; Eſau than Jacob." It appears, indeed, that, on the principal points of controverſy then in debate, Hooper thought with the mild and reſpectable Melancthon, who abominated the wild impieties of Calvin. Of this agreement we ſhall give the following inſtance, which will ſerve to ſhew how widely theſe two illuſtrious reformers differed from Calvin, with regard to the utter inability of man, and the ſole operation of irreſiſtible grace. "Sic," ſays Melancthon, "cum Joan. 6. dictum eſſet, *nemo venit ad me, niſi Pater traxerit eum*; ſequitur ſtatim: *omnis qui audit a patre et diſcit, venit ad me.* Orditur Deus et trahit nos verbo ſuo et ſpiritu ſancto; ſed audire nos oportet et diſcere, id eſt apprehendere promiſſionem et aſſentiri, non repugnare, non indulgere diffidentiæ et dubitationi." Of this paſſage the words of Hooper approach very nearly to a literal tranſlation. "John ſaith, no man cometh to me, except my Father drew him. Many men underſtand theſe words in a wrong ſenſe, as though God required, *in a reaſonable man, no more than in a dead poſt*; and mark not the words that follow: Every man that heareth and learneth of my Father cometh to me. God draweth with his word and the Holy Ghoſt; but man's duty is to heare and learne; that is to ſay, to receive the grace of God, conſent to the promiſe, and not repugne the God that calleth. God doth promiſe the Holy Ghoſt unto them that aſke him, and not to them that contemne him."

The Anti-Calviniſm of Latimer is expreſſed in language than which nothing ſtronger, we believe, is to be found in the writings of any modern Arminian. Of this, abundance of examples might be produced; but the following ſhort paſſage is deciſive of his ſentiments: and we give it a place here, chiefly for the purpoſe of exhibiting to our readers the curious commentary by which an eminent Calviniſtic divine has feebly endeavoured to evade its force. "Chriſt," ſays the good Biſhop, "ſhed as much blood for *Judas*, as he did for *Peter*. Peter believed it, and therefore was ſaved. Judas did not believe, and therefore he was condemned; the fault being in him only, and in nobody elſe." By Mr. Toplady, a boaſted pillar of the Calviniſtic cauſe, the aſſertion of Latimer is thus explained: "Not that Chriſt actually died for Judas, (whoſe death was *prior* to that of Chriſt himſelf;) but that the Mediator's blood was as much ſufficient (ſo infinite was its value) to have redeemed even Judas, as to have redeemed any other perſon, had it been ſhed for that purpoſe. 'Tis plain that Judas ſlew himſelf *ſubſequently* to the apprehenſion, but *antecedently* to the actual crucifixion of Chriſt. The ſoul of Judas, therefore, went to its own place of puniſhment, BEFORE Chriſt had offered himſelf in ſacrifice to God." This is, indeed, a moſt extraordinary argument. According to Mr. Toplady's reaſoning, it is abſurd

ſurd to ſay that Chriſt ſhed his blood for any perſon who died before him; and thus we muſt exclude from the benefit of redemption, not only the wicked, impenitent, and unbelieving, but all the ancient Fathers both previous to, and under, the Moſaic law, of whom the Apoſtle to the Hebrews ſays that they "died in faith," and of whom the Church affirms that they did not "look only for tranſitory promiſes."

The twenty-nine firſt pages of our author's pamphlet conſiſt of a direct and perſonal addreſs to the Biſhop of Lincoln. It contains a curious and motley mixture of miſrepreſentation, ſcurrility, low, unmeaning, Methodiſtical cant, outrageous Calviniſm, diſguſting pride, and pretended humility. He affects to lament, with every writer of his tribe, the decay of religion, and deſertion of our Churches; whilſt his object, like theirs, is, by abuſing the clergy, to ſeduce the people from their lawful paſtors, to thoſe hopeful places where "the voice of prayer and praiſe is heard," he ſays, "AS NEVER BEFORE." (P. 7.) He is very angry with the clergy of a diſtrict in the dioceſe of Lincoln who, in a report to the Biſhop, dared to couple with Antinomians their Calviniſtic brethren, "whoſe lives," he ſays, adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things, and whoſe pariſhes afford the living monuments of the power of godlineſs, *according to the election of grace*. "My Lord," he adds, "let the clergy imitate their examples, and they will have few intruders to complain of; they will ſoon preach them down, and live them down." (P. 23.) Of this, however, we are not quite ſo ſure. All goſpel miniſters are not equally fanatical; and the moſt fanatical will generally run away with the hearers of the reſt. Mr. Robinſon, of Leiceſter, we have reaſon to believe, is deſervedly regarded, among the evangelical party, as a man of eminence; yet even he appears unable to preſerve his people from the influence of officious and ſeducing intruders. In a late very excellent addreſs to his pariſhioners, he laments that many of them "will not afford him the opportunity of delivering to them the important meſſage with which he is commiſſioned." He complains that, "in many caſes, at leaſt, no eminence of ability, no fidelity or diligence, no purity of doctrine or holineſs of life in the pariſh prieſt, have been ſufficient to enſure him the affections even of the more ſerious part of his congregation, who have departed from him, in multitudes, upon the appearance of a ſtrange teacher, whoſe endeavours, as it afterwards appeared, were to unſettle and divide." This, we truſt, is only a general remark, and not a deſcription of Mr. Robinſon's own caſe.* Yet we ſhould not be greatly ſurprized if it were; for Mr. R. is a ſenſible man, and it cannot be concealed that in a goſpel-miniſter, ſuperior popularity, which is the darling idol of the whole fraternity, is not always in proportion to ſuperior ſenſe. For this very reaſon we ſhould be apt to think our Calviniſtic

* If this be Mr. Robinſon's caſe, he has not much right to complain of he conduct of thoſe who have only acted in obedience to his precepts, and n conformity with his example. EDITOR.

Preſ-

Preſbyter a very dangerous neighbour, even to his brethren of the ſame ſentiments; eſpecially as he frankly declares that he conſiders SCHISM, againſt which the Litany directs him to pray, not only as harmleſs, but as, in many caſes, an important duty. For be it known that this conſcientious PRESBYTER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND "had rather hear the pooreſt ſtammerer in a barn, who ſhould preach and teach Jeſus Chriſt in the ſimplicity of his goſpel, than the wiſeſt academician, or the higheſt dignitary in a cathedral, who brought another goſpel which we have not accepted." (P. 25.) The plain Engliſh of this ſplendid ſentence is, that he had rather hear an illiterate, ſelf-commiſſioned, blockhead bawl Calviniſtic blaſphemy and nonſenſe, than the moſt learned Biſhop explain the doctrines, and enforce the duties, of real Chriſtianity. On this ſubject he aſks the following queſtions. "Have not men ſouls, and ſenſe to know that the ſalvation of them is the one thing needful? If little or no attention be paid them by their nominal paſtors," that is, Reader, if their paſtors be not Calviniſtic Methodiſts, "will they not be led readily to embrace the voluntary aſſiſtance offered to them by others; and OUGHT THEY NOT TO DO SO? Is any man bound, by the laws of God or man, to receive no inſtruction but from his pariſh prieſt? And if he finds a miniſtry more edifying and conformable to goſpel truth, is he blameable for attending it? Does not the conſtitution of the land, as well as the law of God, give him the ſame right to worſhip where he pleaſes, and as he pleaſes, as it does to the Biſhop and his clerks?" (PP. 25, 26.) There is a model of a Churchman for you! who will certainly never be guilty of the weakneſs for which Dr. Haweis, another "True Churchman," cenſures poor Melancthon, whom, "ſome educational prejudices reſpecting Church unity and ſchiſm, led ſometimes into conceſſions injurious to the cauſe which he defended:—as if there could be no miniſters, no ſacraments, no ordinances, no church, without biſhops, prieſts, and deacons of epiſcopal ordination." (Haweis Ch. Hiſt. Vol. II. PP. 363 and 485.)

We deem ourſelves infinitely obliged to our author for this ingenuous confeſſion, becauſe it affords a moſt convincing confirmation of what we have always believed and maintained, that the principles of theſe evangelical miniſters, however willingly the more wary part of them would perſuade the world to think otherwiſe, are hoſtile to our eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, and friendly to ſectarianiſm and ſchiſm. But our author is perfectly clear, at leaſt, with regard to "the tendency of Calviniſtic principles to produce, in the moſt effectual manner, righteouſneſs and true holineſs. This," he ſays, "has been ſo often and ſo fully demonſtrated, that nothing but the moſt determined prejudice can bring the matter into diſpute. Their influence on the moral conduct of *all who have truly embraced them*, has been eſtabliſhed by the cleareſt evidence, manifeſted in the word of God, and exemplified wherever the truth, as it is in Jeſus, is preached and believed. (Pp. 20, 21.) The principles of election and grace never led to enthuſiaſm and immorality, but the very re-

verſe,

verſe, wherever they have been held in the light and love of them. (P. 11.) Depend upon it wherever prayerleſs, lawleſs, careleſs conduct is chargeable, they are *no Calviniſts, whatever may be thought or profeſſed.*" (P. 141.) Now if all this is not the moſt egregious trifling, we know not what it is. It has, indeed, the appearance of an appeal to fact; but it is no ſuch thing: for though the great majority of profeſſed Calviniſts were notorious villains and abandoned profligates, the author might ſtill plauſibly ſave his credit, by inſiſting that their principles were not "truly embraced," and were not "held in the light and love of them." In reality the argument, or rather the aſſertion, is good for nothing but to impoſe on ſimple and ſuperficial minds. Accordingly Mr. Overton very eaſily gets rid of the military Calviniſts of the 17th century, by pronouncing them to have been conſummate hypocrites, becauſe it did not ſuit his purpoſe to praiſe rebellion. Our author does not, therefore, at all meet the charge, which is, that the *natural tendency* of the ſyſtem is to render thoſe immoral whom it does not drive to deſpair. We know that it very frequently does both; and if ſome are not equally ſpoilt by it with others, the reaſon is becauſe they are endowed with better diſpoſitions, which ſerve to counteract its malignant influence. But poiſon does not, ſurely, ceaſe to be poiſon becauſe ſome conſtitutions have greater power than others of reſiſting its deleterious effects.

A conſiderable part of this pamphlet (from p. 31 to 119,) is filled with remarks on ſuch of the thirty-nine Articles as the author ſuppoſes to favour Calviniſm, and on the Biſhop's Elements of Chriſtian Theology; but none of his remarks have ſtruck us as new, or as placed in ſuch a luminous point of view as to demand particular conſideration. In ſpeaking of the Three Creeds adopted by the Church, he obſerves, that "they may not be received *partially*, or only as much of them as we like, but *thoroughly*." It is, therefore, to be ſuppoſed that he himſelf "thoroughly receives" that article of the Athanaſian Creed, which declares that "all men ſhall give account for their OWN works;" and yet if we are to judge from the whole drift of his publication, he muſt hold this doctrine in utter abhorrence. He could not well entirely omit the Xth Article, which aſſerts *co-operating*, as well as *preventing* grace, becauſe it came within the number of thoſe which he had engaged to examine; and he ſays (p. 20,) that he believes it. But he immediately adds, that "this grace is ſovereign and free," by which he means that it is confined to a few, and irreſiſtible. He every where, accordingly, treats with the moſt marked diſreſpect and ſcorn the notion of a joint co-operation of our own endeavours with the grace of God. (Pp. 42, 74, 110, 111, &c.) He denies that man has even any power, either to reject or accept the conditions on which his whole fate depends. "The very idea," he ſays, "is incompatible with the *conſtant decree*, and *everlaſting purpoſe* of God." (P. 104.)

Very different indeed are the ſentiments of our venerable Church, which holds every virtue and Chriſtian grace to be, in part, the work of man. This ſhe has, in the cleareſt terms, aſſerted even of

"a true

"a true and lively faith," which is the very root and principle of them all. It is, says the noble Homily on Salvation, "the gift of God, and NOT MAN'S ONLY WORK WITHOUT GOD." (P. 19.)—And this single expreſſion, we may obſerve by the bye, is demonſtrative evidence that Cranmer was no Calviniſt.

Our preſbyter clings, with the fondeſt attachment, to that favourite tenet of all true Calviniſts, That Chriſt died only for a ſmall proportion of the human race; and among them he is poſitive that none can be included to whom the Goſpel has not been preached. How abhorrent this notion is from the doctrine of the Church of England we have largely proved in our remarks on Mr. Overton. To the unanſwerable evidence which we there produced, we ſhall now add from the Homily on the Paſſion, two irrefragable proofs, which did not then occur to us. In one place the words of the Homily are: "So pleaſant was this ſacrifice and oblation of his Son's death, which he ſo obediently and innocently ſuffered, that we ſhould take it for the ONLY AND FULL AMENDS FOR ALL THE SINS OF THE WORLD;" (p. 349;) and, in another place, it is affirmed in language ſtill more deciſive, if poſſible, that "Our Saviour Chriſt ſuffered death UNIVERSALLY FOR ALL MEN." (P. 355.)

The Church of England, then, moſt certainly conſiders all mankind as capable of ſalvation, whether they have heard of the Goſpel or not; nor is her XVIIIth Article, as Preſbyter maintains, in the leaſt inconſiſtent with ſuch a belief. When ſhe ſays that "they are to be held *accurſed*," (which, in the ſtile of eccleſiaſtical canons, means only that their opinion is to be condemned,) "that preſume to ſay that every man ſhall be ſaved by the law or ſect which he profeſſeth;" ſhe pronounces no damnation on thoſe who, while they have never been favoured, by Providence, with the ſuperior advantages of Chriſtianity, have ſincerely endeavoured to lead a virtuous life, according to the beſt rule of action enjoyed by them. Such perſons, on the contrary, ſhe evidently ſuppoſes, may be objects of the gracious mercy of God, and ſaved through the atonement of the univerſal Redeemer. What our author, therefore, calls "the broad aſſertion" of the Biſhop of Lincoln, "millions who never heard the name of Jeſus will be redeemed and bleſſed for ever through the merits of his death," (p. 94,) is an aſſertion which he cannot prove to be falſe, and which is not condemned by the Church of England. What the Church of England means to condemn is the poſition of thoſe who maintain that every good man without the pale of Chriſtianity ſhall be ſaved, independently of the ſacrifice of Chriſt, by virtue of the merit of his obedience to the law under which he lives. Our author, indeed, in one place reads the Article thus: "They are to be held accurſed that preſume to ſay that every man ſhall be ſaved BY (or IN) the law or ſect which he profeſſeth," as if IN and BY were, in this ſituation, exactly of the ſame import; and, undoubtedly, to a perſon who is not much converſant with the ſubject, this ſubſtitution of one ſmall particle for another might appear very harmleſs.

harmleſs. But the author has a deep deſign to ſerve by it; and it is, in truth, a moſt ſtriking inſtance of thoſe diſhoneſt arts to which theſe Evangelical Calviniſts can deſcend for the ſupport of their ſyſtem. To deny that a man can be ſaved "IN a ſect or law," our author well knows, is materially and eſſentially different from denying that he can be ſaved "BY a ſect or law." The former propoſition, which Preſbyter would inſinuate to be the ſenſe of the Article, excludes a man from the POSSIBILITY of ſalvation, ſo long as he continues in that ſect or law, while the latter does not. We are aware that the word in the Latin Article is IN; but both the Latin and Engliſh editions of the Articles are equally authentic. And, in this caſe, though the Latin Article, which is, indeed, ambiguous, will bear the meaning which our author attaches to it, the Engliſh is altogether incapable of that meaning. And we know, beſides, from innumerable paſſages, that ſuch meaning is altogether ſubverſive of the uniform doctrine of the Church of England.

In another place our author talks of this article in language of which we know not what to think. His words are ſo exceedingly ſtrange that, in order to avoid the imputation of miſrepreſenting them, we judge it abſolutely neceſſary to lay them accurately before our readers. "The opinion," he ſays, "is as fatal as falſe, that a perſon, whatever his religion may be, or his educational and national opinion, whether Jew, Turk, or Pagan, may be ſaved if he lives up to his profeſſion, or be careful to frame his life according to his own law, and the light of nature: *on all ſuch* the Church of England, in her eighteenth Article, denounces an awful anathema, and declares *they are to be held* ACCURSED." (P. 42.) Can the author poſſibly mean to inſinuate that the Church pronounces, in her XVIIIth Article, all Jews, Turks, and Pagans accurſed? Such a monſtrous falſhood would, we truſt, be too ſhocking for the conſcience even of a fiery Calviniſt, however blinded by intemperate zeal; and yet the ſentence will admit of no other explanation. But at all events, whatever, in this place, may be his meaning, this author evidently feels no qualms, we do not ſay in miſrepreſenting, but in FALSIFYING, for the ſake of his ſyſtem, the words of that Church of which he ſays that he is a miniſter. Of this we have already given one inſtance, and we ſhall preſently give another ſtill more extraordinary. In all to whom the goſpel of Chriſt is preached, provided they are rational and accountable agents, the Church of England conſiders FAITH as indiſpenſably neceſſary to ſalvation; and to all ſuch, of courſe, ſhe applies our Lord's declaration, "He that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved; but he that believeth not ſhall be damned." She does not, however, preſume to limit the divine mercy, or determine that faith is ſo eſſential to ſalvation that God will ſave none without it. But of this our author is ſo fully convinced, that on the Apoſtle's aſſertion, "God will have all men to be ſaved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth," he puts this very curious conſtruction: "All men whom he wills to be ſaved, muſt come

to

to the knowledge of the truth; and therefore the preaching of the gospel is to be to every creature under heaven." (P. 47.) In conformity with this his fixed persuasion, it appears that, when he repeats his "Te Deum," he says "When thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death, thou didst open the kingdom of Heaven ONLY to all believers." He will hardly deny that, in the following words, he means to refer to this incomparable hymn, and to give the only sense of which the clause referred to is, in his opinion, susceptible. His words are, "The kingdom of Heaven is only open to all believers;" (p. 129;) and these words, by the constant and idiomatic colour of his stile, we are fully authorized to interpret thus: "The kingdom of heaven is open to NONE BUT BELIEVERS." Now, if he be consistent, he must thus read the first rubric at the end of the order for Public Baptism: "It is certainly God's word that the children which are baptised, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly DAMNED." The Church, indeed, says that they are UNDOUBTEDLY SAVED; but, if the kingdom of Heaven be open only to all BELIEVERS, this is clearly, in the nature of the thing, impossible. For, whatever notion we may have of faith; should we even adopt, with regard to it, the wildest reveries of the wildest enthusiast; it must still imply some knowledge of the gospel, of which infants are altogether incapable. The Church of England, therefore, holds no such opinion as that for which this presbyter contends, that all must necessarily be damned without remedy, who know not the gospel.

The certain salvation of all baptized infants, dying before they commit actual sin, can never be admitted by any Calvinist; and, therefore, no Calvinist, we confidently maintain, can possibly subscribe the Book of Common Prayer *ex animo*, and with a good conscience. Our author, very plainly, disbelieves the doctrine; and he gets rid of the subject with this shuffling observation, "That respecting infants, little, very little, is to be found in the Scripture. And whenever the Scripture is silent, we must be content not even to desire to be wise above what is written." (P. 128, 129.) Now we think, on the contrary, that what is found, in scripture, concerning infants is far from being little; for however little it may be in words, it is great in importance. Our Saviour seems to have regarded infants with peculiar affection, and certainly treated them with singular kindness; for "he embraced them in his arms, he laid his hands upon them and blessed them." We cannot consider it as little that he who knew the mind of God, and the terms of salvation, much better than any conceited Calvinist, "commanded the children to be brought unto him, blamed those that would have kept them from him, and exhorted all men to follow their innocency." But "admitting," says our author, "the SALVABILITY of infants, they must have received the Holy Ghost as well as we." (P. 126.) If these words have any rational sense, it must be that infants, supposing them salvable, are admitted to the enjoyment of future bliss, only through the gratuitous mercy of God, and the universal atonement of Christ;

for to talk of a *moral* influence of the Holy Ghoſt on the minds of infants would be ridiculous. But why ſhould Preſbyter ſo ſtrenuouſly deny that ſuch influence may be conferred on virtuous men under the law of nature? It muſt, ſurely, be a cruel ſyſtem of faith which pronounces ſuch men as Plato and Socrates incapable of that divine aſſiſtance of which they were ſo ſenſible that they ſtood in need. It is, to us, a ſource of unſpeakable ſatisfaction that ſuch is not the faith of the Church of England. "The promiſe of grace," ſays the venerable Hooper, "appertaineth to every ſort of men in the world." Should our readers wiſh for more numerous proofs of the ſentiments of this eminent divine, whom our Calviniſtic author ſo impudently ranks as a martyr in the cauſe, they will find them, in abundance, in that ſame Preface which we have quoted, and in which the tenets of our Church are moſt accurately expreſſed. This prelate, they will find, expreſsly denies that the image of God is effaced in man by original ſin. He teaches, with St. Paul, that the effects of Chriſt's death are, in all reſpects, commenſurate to thoſe of Adam's fall; ſo that no man, on account of Adam's ſin alone, ſhall incur eternal damnation. He maintains, in the moſt unambiguous terms, that Chriſt, on the croſs, made atonement for the ſins of all mankind without exception; that no man is, by neceſſity of deſtiny, pulled up into Heaven, or thruſt down into Hell; that the ſole cauſe of reprobation is ſin in man; not, however, every ſin, but only that which indicates contempt of God's word and grace. And, finally, his notion of election is, that we are ſaid to be elected, by God, from eternity, BECAUSE we are AFTERWARDS made the MEMBERS OF CHRIST.

This writer, however, as well as Mr. Overton, affects to diſavow the moſt horrid part of the Calviniſtic ſyſtem. "It is declamation," he ſays, "and merely terrific, when the ſpectre of reprobation is conjured up to affright the fearful. It is not any eternal decree or lack of irreſiſtible grace that renders a man criminal, and expoſes him to wrath and damnation, but his own ſinful nature and conduct, led away by his own heart's luſt, and enticed." (P. 107.)—We know not what theſe rebellious Calviniſts gain, by deſerting, in this caſe, the ſtandard of their leader. If they think that, by rejecting the decree of reprobation, as underſtood in the Calviniſtic ſenſe, they can, in any degree, vindicate the attributes of God, they are, ſurely, miſtaken. "But even if God, as the Biſhop aſſerts," (and, we beg leave to add, as St. Paul aſſerts,) "formed his *predeſtination* on his *preſcience*, would that even, if conceded, ultimately make the leaſt difference in the number of thoſe who are ſaved and thoſe who periſh?" (P. 106.) We do not ſay that it would; but that is not the queſtion. The queſtion is Whether we ſhall dare to aſcribe to God a conduct which would diſgrace the moſt lawleſs and capricious tyrant; and that, too, in oppoſition to the plaineſt declarations of holy Scripture, and of the excellent Church to which we belong. Our author, however, patches up the difficulty by quoting

ing the fooliſh profeſſion of Luther: "Was it in my power to comprehend it, and clearly to make out how God is both inviolably juſt and infinitely merciful, notwithſtanding the diſplay of wrath and ſeeming inequality in his diſpenſations reſpecting the reprobate, faith would have little or nothing to do." Our author has, certainly, nothing farther to do but to adopt, for his motto, "Credo quia impoſſibile eſt."

On the ſubject of juſtification, our preſbyter, we think, is particularly unlucky in his efforts to reconcile St. Paul and St. James. St. James, he ſays, "is arguing on the neceſſity of SHEWING OUR FAITH *by our works*, and we cannot ſhew what we have not got." (P. 79.) He therefore concludes that the Apoſtle is ſpeaking of our juſtification "before men." (P. 80.) But the apoſtle is, very evidently, ſpeaking of our juſtification *in the ſight of God*, as appears by the queſtion "Can faith *ſave* him?" Beſides, how could it eſcape this writer's notice that his commentary makes St. James talk nonſenſe. Whatever we may ſuppoſe the Apoſtle to intend by juſtification, he aſcribes it partly to faith, and partly to works. "Ye ſee then how that by works a man is juſtified, and not by faith only." This, according to our author's interpretation, means "Ye ſee then how that by works a man's faith is demonſtrated to the world, and not by his faith ONLY." We ſhould have thought it impoſſible that, in the ſight of men, a man's faith could, in any degree, be demonſtrated by ITSELF. It no where appears, our author contends, that St. James wrote to correct the errors which had ariſen from miſapprehenſion of the writings of St. Paul. (P. 82.) He muſt know, however, that ſuch has been the general opinion of the Church, particularly of his favourite Auguſtine; and that theſe errors have, almoſt unanimouſly, been ſuppoſed to relate to the doctrine of juſtification. But the queſtion is, in truth, of little conſequence; nor is it of much greater whether St. Peter (Ep. II. Cap. 4. v. 16.) alludes to thoſe parts of St. Paul's Epiſtles which treat of that doctrine, when he ſays of them that they contain things "hard to be underſtood." But, on this ſubject, our author's *critical* acumen is diſplayed. "St. Peter," he affirms, "does not ſay that St. Paul's Epiſtles are more hard to be underſtood than the other ſcriptures; but that reſpecting the coming of our Lord to judgment, many things are ſaid that are as yet to us obſcure, and of difficult interpretation. The pronoun ἐν αἷς," he adds, "it is evident cannot agree with ἐπιστολαῖς, but with λόγοις, the immediate antecedent, and in the neuter, not the feminine gender." (P. 83.) If our author know any thing of biblical criticiſm, he muſt know that this remark, even grammatically conſidered, is not worth a ſtraw. With regard to the ſenſe, it manifeſtly has not the effect, which he intended, of removing from St. Paul's Epiſtles the imputation of obſcurity. Whatever the things are which St. Peter calls obſcure, they are evidently contained in St. Paul's Epiſtles; and to us it appears that even St. Paul could ſcarcely ſpeak, in his Epiſtles, of things hard to be underſtood," while the Epiſtles themſelves were perfectly plain. That this Apoſtle's

tle's writings, eſpecially ſuch parts of them as relate to juſtification by faith, are often highly obſcure, has been felt and acknowledged by thoſe whom WE would call the brighteſt ornaments of the Church of God, both in ancient and in modern times. But our author will exclude both us and them from the number of thoſe in whom "God the Spirit *has opened the underſtanding to underſtand the Scriptures.*" (P. 82.) That he claims this divine illumination himſelf, we entertain not a doubt; and, therefore, it is no wonder that he finds St. Paul's Epiſtles ſo perſpicuous. To him the Scriptures cannot be, as they are to the uninſpired, "a book ſealed, and a goſpel hid." (Ib.) But WE muſt be content to rank with thoſe who, in the interpretation of Scripture, "purſue the means of divine appointment, REASONING out of the word of truth, if peradventure," as he ſays, "God will give them repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth." (Ib.)

Our author pretends (p. 52,) to "have ſummarily ſtated the ſubſtance of the *doctrinal* Articles of the Church of England." We ſuppoſe that he does not regard the XXXIſt as a doctrinal Article; for, in his ſummary, he has totally omitted it. The ſame ſpirit of fairneſs and impartiality runs through the compariſon which, in the latter part of his pamphlet, he has inſtituted with a view to ſhew that the Homilies and Liturgy are in uniſon with the Articles, and, conſequently, Calviniſtic. He has made a pretty copious ſelection of paſſages which ſpeak of the neceſſity of grace; a neceſſity for which the Right Rev. and learned writer whom he attacks and moſt indecently inſults, contends as ſtrenuouſly as he can do himſelf.—But he has carefully avoided every phraſe or expreſſion which implies that, with the aſſiſtance of grace, man muſt diligently work out his own ſalvation; and becauſe the Church maintains, in conformity to Scripture, that, without the aids of God's Holy Spirit, we are able to do nothing, he concludes, in oppoſition to common ſenſe, that with them we are able to do nothing likewiſe. He ſometimes has the conſummate aſſurance completely to miſrepreſent the tenets of his maſter. Thus he roundly aſſerts (p. 38,) that "the true ſtate of man by *nature* fallen, is the corner-ſtone of the doctrine called Calviniſtic." But this aſſertion is a notorious falſhood; for the true corner-ſtone of that blaſphemous doctrine is not "the ſtate of man by nature fallen," but the everlaſting decree of God, FORE-ORDAINING HIS FALL, and the CERTAIN DAMNATION of by far the greater part of his poſterity. But in the Article of God's being the only agent in fitting the elect for future glory, he is a correct and orthodox Calviniſt. His grace, as we have ſeen, is ſovereign and irreſiſtible. Of good works, it is true, he talks in the ſame ſtile with the reſt of his brethren. "No man," he ſays, "who argues for God's predeſtination, and his election by grace, ever doubted the neceſſity of good works, *in all believers*, to whom the kingdom of Heaven is opened." (P. 148.) But this neceſſity is ſimply and purely, the mechanical neceſſity by which the inſtrument is made to contribute to the purpoſes of the artiſt. Theſe works are the works of the perſon who performs them preciſely as the forging of a bar of iron is the

work

work of the hammer and of the anvil. We ſhall, therefore, take leave of this publication, of which our readers, perhaps, will think that they have had enough, with calling their attention to one paſſage more. It is found in the 24th page of the pamphlet, and, in a very ſhort compaſs, gives ſuch a ſingular diſplay of the candour, the modeſty, and the admirable conſiſtency of theſe evangelical Calviniſtic miniſters as cannot fail to afford both inſtruction and amuſement.

Thoſe clergy of the dioceſe of Lincoln who made, to the Biſhop, the report already mentioned, of the ſtate of religion within their diſtrict, bring againſt them, it ſeems, "ſtrange charges of exorciſms, and denunciations, and enthuſiaſtic practices." Theſe charges, of courſe, our author with the utmoſt indignation repels. "There may have been," he ſays, "a man of Arminian leaven, and enthuſiaſtic ideas, among the followers of Mr. Weſley, though I never knew one, who pretended to theſe ſupernatural powers; but I defy the moſt inveterate of our maligners to produce an individual among the Calviniſts who ever countenanced ſuch pretenſions." Into the matter of fact reſpecting theſe exorciſms we ſhall not now enter; although the public, we imagine, will find no difficulty in deciding between the authority of this anonymous preſbyter, and the credit due to a numerous body of reſpectable clergymen, advancing a charge which they have authenticated with their names, and preſented, in a manner and form the moſt ſolemn, to their dioceſan. What we wiſh our readers particularly to obſerve is the ungenerous treatment which poor Weſley receives, to whom, though as a ſchiſmatic it was utterly impoſſible for any man to have higher merit, no mercy or brotherly tenderneſs is ſhewn, and that merely becauſe he was a wicked Arminian. But Whitfield and his followers can be no enthuſiaſts, becauſe they are genuine godly Calviniſts. This, *a priori*, is abundantly evident; for Calviniſts "are men too enlightened in the myſteries of godlineſs; they are better acquainted with their own hearts, and their deceitfulneſs; they feel in themſelves too much to lament and condemn; they denounce no wrath but on the impenitent; they invite poor ſinners of every rank and degree to be reconciled to God, to come and take of the water of life freely: if men periſh, it is becauſe they will not come to Chriſt that they might have life." This eloquent ſentence, which, for unity of ſubject and compactneſs of conſtruction, is, certainly, unparalleled, is intended as a proof that Calviniſts are no enthuſiaſts, and, of conſequence, are incapable of pretending to exorciſms. If any of our readers are unfortunate enough not clearly to perceive the connection between the proof and the propoſition to be proved, we are ſorry for their dulneſs; but we can give them no aſſiſtance. To be honeſt and own a degrading truth, we are here as much in the dark as they are; and, what is more, we very ſhrewdly ſuſpect that the author himſelf ſaw juſt as much of the matter as either of us. But when theſe benevolent gentlemen gravely inform us that "they invite poor ſinners of every

rank and degree to be reconciled to God," we are forced to ſuppoſe that they are privately laughing at us: for on the neceſſarian principles of Calviniſtic predeſtination, the invitation would be more than a manifeſt abſurdity: it would be nothing leſs than downright mockery and inſult. If they are in earneſt, we can only ſay that, of all mankind, they are moſt fooliſhly and idly employed. When they tell us that "if men periſh, it is becauſe they will not come to Chriſt," they tell us a notorious and barefaced lie; for, according to the whole contexture of Calviniſm, the cauſe of men's perdition is not that they will not come to Chriſt, but that an everlaſting decree prevents them. We conclude with moſt heartily adopting the ſentiment expreſſed by our author at the cloſe of this paragraph: "When will men be candid, and ceaſe to pervert the good ways of the Lord!"

---

*The Articles of the Church of England proved not to be Calviniſtic.* By Thomas Kipling, D. D. Dean of Peterborough, and late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Large 8vo. Pp. 94. Mawman and Hurſt, London; Deighton, Cambridge; Cooke, Oxford; and Todd, York. 1802.

THIS is a publication of uncommon merit; and it is with ſingular ſatisfaction that we introduce it to the knowledge of our readers. It contains, within a very moderate compaſs, an able vindication of the doctrines of our Church from the imputation of Calviniſm, with which they have been ſo pertinaciouſly charged, and a moſt convincing corroboration of opinions which it has been our uniform endeavour to ſupport and diſſeminate. The Dean of Peterborough is a profeſſed reviewer, and, in our eſtimation, a very maſterly one, with whom we ſhould be proud to claim a nearer acquaintance, and whom we ſhould reckon it an honour to hail as a brother. The writers to whom his particular attention is more immediately directed are two on whom we lately beſtowed ſome portion of our labours, the author of "The true Churchmen aſcertained," and the anonymous "Preſbyter" of congenial ſentiments. Dr. Kipling does not, indeed, enter into a detailed analyſis of their works, or undertake to expoſe the innumerable inſtances of ſophiſtical reaſoning, groundleſs aſſertion, and illiberal abuſe, with which theſe works are embelliſhed and garniſhed from beginning to end; but he cuts up their *principle* by the very root, eraſes the very foundation on which their edifice is erected, and leaves not, by conſequence, one ſtone upon another of their whole ſuperſtructure. To confeſs the truth, we have often been ſurprized how theſe two writers, eſpecially Mr. Overton, who certainly is not deficient in perſpicacity, ſhould have had the temerity to truſt the very life of a favourite cauſe to a principle which, unleſs they were unaccountably blinded by habitual and inveterate prejudice, or entertained a ſtrange confidence in their own powers of deception,

and

and a ſovereign contempt for the intellectual faculties of every Anti-Calviniſt, they muſt inſtantly have ſeen was wholly untenable: yet they have, as the Dean of Peterborough expreſſes it, "conſented to reſt the termination of this queſtion, 'Whether it was the intention, or not, of the compilers of our Articles that ſome of them ſhould be interpreted and ſubſcribed in a Calviniſtic ſenſe,' entirely upon the event of this one enquiry, 'Is our eſtabliſhed Liturgy in correſpondence with Calviniſm?'" (P. 3.) And here the Dean joins iſſue with theſe writers. In laying before our readers ſome account of this pamphlet, our taſk will be equally agreeable and eaſy. We are very anxious that, as it well deſerves, it ſhould be generally known; and we think that we cannot adopt a better method of effectually recommending it to the notice of the public, than allowing the author to ſpeak largely for himſelf.

The natural execution of Dr. K.'s plan was by inſtituting a compariſon between the public ſtandards of the Church of England, and the genuine, authenticated doctrines of Calvin. We ſay the *genuine, authenticated* doctrines; for, as our learned author judiciouſly obſerves, "It cannot be too extenſively known, that, of all thoſe writers who have lately taken up their pens, as they pretend, to demonſtrate that the Liturgy and Articles of the Church of England are CALVINISTIC, though they have quoted and referred to nearly FIFTY different authors, no one has even once quoted CALVIN for this purpoſe; but that every one has paſſed over his Inſtitutes and other works in the ſame degree of ſilence, as he muſt have done, had not one ſyllable of what Calvin publiſhed been extant at preſent either in print or in manuſcript. This ſilence is the effect, not of ignorance, but of deſign. Thoſe writers are well aware that the tenets peculiar to Calviniſm are both hideous in themſelves, and diametrically oppoſite to the doctrines of the Church of England; and have therefore, the better to effect their purpoſe, ſtudiouſly and induſtriouſly kept them out of ſight." (P. 6.) But a ſeparate and diſtinct compariſon of every doctrine in Calvin's Theological Syſtem with our Book of Common Prayer would be both an endleſs and unneceſſary undertaking. "For, if thoſe peculiar doctrines of Calvin be excepted, which have no connection with our preſent inquiry, there is not," ſays Dr. K. "I believe, one of his peculiarities which may not be comprized under his ſingle doctrine of PREDESTINATION. I ſhall, therefore, confine myſelf to this one inquiry, 'Is our eſtabliſhed Liturgy in perfect uniſon and correſpondence with Calvin's doctrine of PREDESTINATION?'" (P. 4.)

Our author, adverting to Mr. Overton's attempt to garble and refine the ſyſtem of Calvin, finds it neceſſary to ſettle in what preciſe ſenſe the words "Calviniſtic" and "Anti-Calviniſtic" can be uſed, with propriety, in this diſpute. And theſe terms, he ſays, can be rightly applied, only to ſuch of our 39 Articles, if ſuch there be, as treat of ſome doctrine *peculiar* to Calvin's ſyſtem. For, though the doctrine of the Trinity, for example, as taught by our Church and

as taught by that reformer, is exactly the ſame, yet no one would affirm that the doctrine of the Trinity is a *Calviniſtic doctrine*, or that the two firſt and the fifth of the 39 Articles are *Calviniſtic Articles*, or meant to be ſubſcribed in a *Calviniſtic ſenſe*. If an Article of religion, our author contends, in which ſome doctrine *peculiar* to Calvin's theology is handled and explained, preciſely correſponds with what Calvin has written on the ſame ſubject, ſuch Article is Calviniſtic, and was intended to be ſubſcribed in the Calviniſtic ſenſe. If, on the other hand, any Article of religion is not reconcileable with ſome one of Calvin's peculiarities, it is not a Calviniſtic Article; and, if any Article militates againſt Calvin's ſyſtem, it muſt be deemed an Anti-Calviniſtic Article, deſigned by its framers, to be underſtood and ſubſcribed in an Anti-Calviniſtic ſenſe. Theſe poſitions, we conceive, will be readily granted; and they muſt, it is evident, be equally true when the inquiry is extended to any part of our Liturgical ſervices.

Dr. Kipling, having thus, in his firſt chapter, fixed the ſtate of the queſtion, with the method to be purſued in reſolving it, and laid down ſome neceſſary previous explanations, proceeds, in the ſecond, (from p. 9 to 52,) to ſhew what Calvin's PREDESTINATION implies. The ſketch which he gives of it, and which is unſpeakably horrible, is comprehended in fourteen diſtinct propoſitions. With theſe we ſhall faithfully make our readers acquainted, in Dr. Kipling's own words; premiſing that every one of them is inconteſtibly proved to be a doctrine of Calvin, by copious extracts from the edition of his works publiſhed at Amſterdam in 1667.

"I. That Omnipotent Being, who has exiſted from all eternity, after he had decreed to create man in his own image, and had fore-ordained his fall from original righteouſneſs, by which fall Adam's own nature would be corrupted and depraved, viewed with the eye of preſcience the whole of Adam's offſpring as a MASS OF CORRUPTION AND PERDITION."

"II. Among the vaſt multitude of human beings compoſing this maſs of corruption and perdition, Almighty God decreed, before the foundation of the world, to bring ſome to everlaſting ſalvation, and to damn all the reſt eternally. This decree or purpoſe of God is denominated by Calvin PREDESTINATION, ſome being thereby predeſtined to everlaſting happineſs, and others condemned by it to everlaſting miſery."

"III. The objects of this decree are, not collective bodies of men, as Jews, Gentiles, Greeks, Romans, but individuals, as John, Matthew, Thomas, Peter, every one of whoſe fate after death is fixed by it, before he is born, immutably and everlaſtingly."

"IV. Adam, agreeably to the pre-ordinance of God, (for we are now come to the execution of his decrees) fell from innocence: and in conſequence of this lapſe the whole of man's nature, as the Deity had foreſeen and foreordained, underwent a complete change: it became corrupt, depraved, vicious: and every deſcendent of Adam, through his firſt parents' tranſgreſſion, became a loſt, a damned, an accurſed creature, and fuel for the flame of divine vengeance."

"V. From the birth of Abraham (if not from an earlier period) to this preſent

preſent time, the Deity, agreeably to his eternal purpoſe and immutable decree, hath conſtantly been taking, and will continue daily to take thoſe individuals, whom he predeſtinated, before the world began, to everlaſting ſalvation, out of this maſs of corruption and perdition. All the reſt, every one, whom he paſſeth by, and leaves in this ſtate of corruption and perdition, he reprobates; that is, abandons to wickedneſs in this life, and will torture eternally in the next."

"Thoſe whom he makes choice of, ſelects, and ſegregates, for ſalvation, are called ELECT. Thoſe whom he leaves in their original pollution, abandons, and will eternally torment, are called ſometimes preterites, (præteriti) but moſt commonly REPROBATES."

"By election and reprobation is executed the immutable decree of predeſtination."

"VI. This diſcrimination made by the Deity between the elect and the reprobates is arbitrary; in no degree owing to any ſuperior excellence, worth, or merit in the former, either preſent and actual, or future and foreſeen, but wholly and ſolely to God's will and pleaſure."

"He extricates the elect from deſtruction for a demonſtration of his mercy and goodneſs. He leaves the reprobates in their original ſtate of perdition for a diſplay of his power and glory."

"VII. The elect are put under the cuſtody and protection of Chriſt Jeſus; and, do what they will in this life, they cannot fail of being ſaved finally, being under an immutable decree, and guarded by Omnipotence. The reprobates, how much ſoever they may exert themſelves for the purpoſe, cannot attain everlaſting ſalvation, being *hindered* therefrom, and *repelled* by Almighty God."

"As the final ſalvation of the elect is in no degree doubtful, from their firſt entrance into this world to their departure out of it, but is all that time fixed and certain; ſo neither is the eternal damnation of a reprobate ever uncertain during his paſſage through this world, but is even before he is born, unalterably fixed and ſure. That he ſhould periſh, is the very purpoſe for which he was created."

"VIII. Neither the beſt purpoſes, nor the beſt endeavours, nor the beſt acts, of an elect, even after regeneration, are in any wiſe *preparatory* to eternal ſalvation. On the contrary, as the elect people of God, under the Moſaic diſpenſation, were commanded to deſiſt on the ſabbath day from their *worldly* occupations, ſo, in reſpect of all *ſpiritual* concerns, the elect under the goſpel-diſpenſation are enjoined to bid adieu to all wills, works, and endeavours of their own, and to keep moſt religiouſly a perpetual ſabbath; that there may be free and ample ſcope within them for the operations of God's ſpirit."

"IX. God, who of his own will and pleaſure predeſtinated the elect to eternal ſalvation *himſelf prepares* and fits them for it. The means uſed by him for this purpoſe are the preaching of his word, and the operations of his ſpirit; both which together conſtitute what is denominated ſpecial calling."

"X. The operations of God's ſpirit are manifold. 1. He forms in the elect a new UNDERSTANDING. 2. He deſtroys their natural, and creates in them a new WILL. 3. EVERY PROPENSITY they may have, and EVERY EFFORT they may make, to do works pleaſing and acceptable unto God, is His. 4. He alſo it is who begins, continues, and finiſhes, every good

good WORK done by them; and who makes them perſevere unto the end in well-doing."

"In each of theſe operations he does not concur or CO-OPERATE with the elect, but is SOLE and ENTIRE OPERATOR; and they are his inſtruments or organs."

"XI. Though the elect may for a time reſiſt the grace of God, they cannot finally overcome it. This grace is ſovereign, and invincible in its operation."

"XII. God, who arbitrarily predeſtinated the reprobates to eternal deſtruction, himſelf alſo *prepares* and fits them for it. He does this by blinding their minds, hardening their hearts, ſtupifying their intellects, depriving them of the knowledge of himſelf, withholding from them the influence of his ſpirit, and delivering them over to the devil."

"XIII. The number of the elect is very ſmall: the reprobates of courſe are numberleſs."

"XIV. The reprobates, thoſe numberleſs rational beings, whom Almighty God hath raiſed up for the illuſtrating of his glory, are hateful to him. He alſo hates, in proportion to their naughtineſs, the choſen few."

The quotations by which our induſtrious author has ſubſtantiated theſe ſeveral doctrines as undoubted parts of Calvin's theological creed, our limits will not permit us to tranſcribe; but our readers will find, on peruſing the pamphlet, that they furniſh a proof irreſiſtible and complete. One or two of the notes, however, with which this chapter is accompanied we cannot prevail with ourſelves to omit. Under the Xth of the foregoing propoſitions Dr. Kipling writes thus:

"Calvin ſays expreſsly in this ſection that good works are the fruits of grace. In the XIIth Article it is expreſsly ſaid that good works are the fruits of faith. In this Article, therefore, the founders of our Church have flatly contradicted Calvin; which is a plain proof that they were Anti-Calviniſts, and that this is an Anti-Calviniſtic Article."

"By grace Calvin means in this ſection the third perſon in the Trinity; and what he means by ſaying that good works are the fruits of grace, is expreſſed by him in theſe words, *Omne bonum in nobis opus non niſi gratiam facere*, which conclude this ſection. What he affirms then is this, that every good work in us is not ours, but *wholly* and *ſolely* the workmanſhip of the Holy Ghoſt; that it is done in no degree by us, but by this perſon alone. But whatever is wrought and done and performed entirely by a divine perſon, cannot alſo proceed from a Chriſtian grace. Faith can have no ſhare in the production of it. So that this is not a mere verbal difference, but a difference in doctrine. A Church of England man's faith is productive; a Calviniſt's is barren." (P. 33.)

The following obſervations are ſo pointed and ſo juſt that we think they muſt be felt by thoſe whom they concern. Having mentioned the vehemence with which Calvin maintains that in the work of man's ſalvation, the grace of God is *ſole operator*, Dr. Kipling adds:

"But in the Xth Article it is ſaid, *Dei gratiâ nos præveniente ut velimus, et* CO-OPERANTE *dum volumus, ad pietatis opera facienda*. No words can be more pointedly directed againſt Calvin's ſyſtem than theſe are. What he

he poſitively denied, this Article poſitively affirms. It is conſequently an Anti-Calviniſtic Article."

"Preſbyter affirms that our 39 Articles cannot be ſubſcribed *ex animo*, but in their literal and grammatical ſenſe, and that in their literal and grammatical ſenſe they are only capable of a Calviniſtic meaning. He has therefore ſubſcribed to this Xth Article, which aſſerts the co-operation of divine grace, as aſſerting that the grace of God does not co-operate with our endeavours."

"It is affirmed alſo by Mr. Overton that the literal ſenſe of our Articles is Calviniſtic. And he too, like Preſbyter, is a decided enemy to all latitude of interpretation. He then, as well as Preſbyter, when he ſubſcribed to this Xth Article, committed a crime cloſely bordering upon perjury."

"Hence we may learn what ſort of morals they be, which are taught and practiſed in 'the true Church.' If its miniſters, the evangelical preachers, will knowingly and deliberately, and in the moſt ſolemn manner, *teste epiſcopo*, give their conſent in writing to this propoſition, that there is no difference whatever between both hands and one hand (which, in effect, they do when they ſubſcribe to this Anti-Calviniſtic Article in a Calviniſtic ſenſe) in order to gain admittance into the miniſtry of the Church eſtabliſhed, what will they NOT do or ſay, when they have gained admittance." (P. 37.)

The barbarity and impiety of a number of Calvin's peculiar tenets are well known to all who are but moderately verſed in theological controverſy. But ſome of our readers may not, even yet, be ſufficiently aware of the atrocious extent to which this daring dogmatiſt was capable of carrying his ſpeculations on the ſubject of the decrees of God. To many, we ſuſpect, the information conveyed in a part of the Dean of Peterborough's note on the XIIIth of the above ſeries of propoſitions, will be altogether new. It gives, in truth, ſuch a proof of the unparalleled preſumption of this reformer's head, as well as of the cold, malignant, and cruel diſpoſitions of his heart, as is almoſt inconceivable. And we think that all muſt concur in admiring the prudence, at leaſt, of his wary diſciples, when, inſtead of exhibiting a full and fair delineation of his doctrines, they ſtudiouſly and induſtriouſly keep them out of ſight.

"Calvin was of opinion, that among thoſe perſons to whom the word of God is preached, the number of reprobates is to that of the elect NEARLY IN THE PROPORTION OF FOUR TO ONE. (Inſt. L. III. C. xxiv. 12.) What portion of the *whole* human race he thought was predeſtinated by the Deity, before the world began, to everlaſting deſtruction, I have not been able to aſcertain. The reader will however be able, from what has now been mentioned, to collect that it muſt be a very large one; and moreover that the Son of God, who, if an Apoſtle is to be credited, 'died for all,' according to John Calvin died for a very few." (P. 44.)

In Calvin's divinity the whole human race is divided into the elect and the reprobate. On this point his language is conſiſtent and uniform. "Deus quoſdam elegit, *relictis* aliis; . . . quos vult eligere, aliis *rejectis*: eligit alios, aliis *præteritis*, &c." And he expreſsly contends,

tends, in oppoſition to thoſe who rejected reprobation, that it forms an eſſential part of the ſyſtem, and that without it election could not poſſibly ſtand. "Ipſa electio, niſi reprobationi oppoſita; non ſtaret. *Quos ergo Deus præterit, reprobat.*" But many of his followers pretend, on this ſubject to diſpute his authority, and allege that reprobation is no conſequence of unconditional election. To lay his diſpute for ever at reſt, Dr. Kipling has given a ſtrict logical demonſtration of what Calvin has aſſerted, that the doctrines of election and reprobation are ſo cloſely interwoven, and ſo intimately connected, that they muſt neceſſarily be either both true or both falſe. This demonſtration we ſhall here inſert; after reminding our readers that, in Calvin's language, the words *præteriti*, *relicti*, *rejecti*, and *reprobi*, are exactly ſynonymous; and that, by Adam's tranſgreſſion, both he and his poſterity became one maſs of corruption and perdition, out of which maſs certain individuals are extricated on account of the merits and death of Chriſt.

"Suppoſe now, (ſays the Dean) that of this maſs not a ſingle individual has ever been reprobated by the Deity, then, in the language of Calvin, none has ever been paſſed by, none rejected by him."

"But if none be paſſed by, and rejected, none can have been ſelected and choſen."

"Conſequently, if there be no ſuch perſons as Calvin terms reprobates, there can exiſt none of thoſe whom he calls elect."

"So alſo, on the other hand, if, from this maſs of fallen creatures, any have been ſelected, choſen, ſegregated, ſome muſt be left behind, paſſed by, and rejected. So that, if there be any ſuch perſons as Calvin denominates elect, there muſt alſo be perſons whom he ſtyles reprobates." (P. 50.)

In our ſtrictures on Mr. Overton's book, we aſſerted that the attempt of that author to diſguiſe the precious ſyſtem of his maſter, and his affectation of rejecting ſome parts of it, while he adopted others, were mere labour loſt, becauſe no man can be a Calviniſt by halves. Of the truth of this aſſertion we had long been convinced; and we gave our reaſons for advancing it. We are happy to find that the ſame conviction is entertained by the Dean of Peterborough; but he has expreſſed the grounds of that conviction in ſo ſuperior and happy a ſtyle, that our readers, we doubt not, will thank us for copying them.

"Calviniſm reſembles a machine ſo modelled and conſtructed, that if any one wheel, or any one peg, were taken out of it, the whole would fall in pieces. Suppoſe, for example, that the doctrine of reprobation was taken from Calvin's ſyſtem; then alſo, as may be gathered from the above demonſtration, would the doctrine of election follow. But with the elects and reprobates would the doctrine of decrees concerning them be aboliſhed. And were there none of theſe parts of his ſyſtem in exiſtence, invincible grace, that main ſpring of Calviniſm, would ceaſe to have either any object to act upon, or any end to effect. Again, ſuppoſe the doctrine of invincible grace to have no foundation in truth; on this ſuppoſition there would

would not be an agent in exiſtence to hinder ſome of Adam's progeny from falling away finally. That is, there would be no Calviniſtic elect: conſequently no reprobates; therefore none predeſtinated; no abſolute decrees; nor any thing elſe peculiar to Calviniſm. Laſtly, the ſame thing would follow, if Calvin's doctrine of original ſin were taken from his ſyſtem. The *exiſtence* of that corrupt maſs, which Adam's fall is ſaid to have engendered, depends upon this doctrine. And if you annihilate this maſs, you annihilate the very materials of which Calvin's elect and reprobates are formed. "Deum experditâ maſſâ eligere et reprobare." Conſequently, as before, no part of his ſyſtem would remain. It were eaſy to illuſtrate the truth of what I have advanced above by various other inſtances. But theſe which I have already given are of themſelves ſufficient to ſhew that the truth of each Calviniſtic tenet is neceſſary to the truth of every other: that no perſon can, therefore, be a piece of a Calviniſt, and that to talk of 'a moderate and a milder Calviniſm' is to uſe the ſigns of ideas without any ideas annexed to them." (P. 51.)

It is proper here to take notice of Dr. Kipling's obſervation on Calvin's definition of ORIGINAL SIN. That definition aſſerts that every deſcendant of Adam, *ſolely* on account of that corruption which he inherits from his firſt parent, is *actually* convicted and damned. "Ob talem *duntaxat* corruptionem—damnati convictique tenemur." The meaning of this we apprehend to be that all mankind are, in conſequence of their hereditary corruption *only*, under *actual ſentence* of damnation. "But, (ſays our acute and diſcriminating author), in the IXth Article of our Church, entituled 'Of Original or Birth Sin,' it is only affirmed that this hereditary corruption of nature '*deſerveth* damnation.' This, (adds the Dean, with eminent felicity and juſtneſs of diſtinction,) is not *a trifling*, but *a very material* difference. For, unleſs the whole of Adam's progeny be *actually* in a ſtate of damnation, there are no materials to form Calvin's elect and reprobates of 'Ex *damnatâ Adæ ſobole* Deus, quos viſum eſt eligit, quos vult, reprobat.' From whence it follows, incontrovertibly, that this IXth Article is NOT Calviniſtic." (P. 15.)

In Dr. Kipling's third chapter, which completes his plan, the Liturgy of the Church of England is in ſeveral ſtriking inſtances, compared with Calvin's doctrine of predeſtination; and the irreconcileable oppoſition between them is placed in the ſtrongeſt and moſt convincing light. Some particular paſſages, on which our author's compariſon is founded, are the ſame which, in our Review of Mr. Overton's Publication, we ſelected from the Liturgy, for a ſimilar purpoſe; and the argument from them is urged with ſuch a peculiar and commanding force as no common degree of prejudice, we think can withſtand. The firſt of them, which, from its very ſituation, is undoubtedly a prominent one, is the repreſentation of Almighty God in the beginning of the abſolution at daily morning and evening prayer. In that repreſentation the Deity is ſaid, 1. Not to deſire the death of a ſinner; 2. To deſire that he may turn from his wickedneſs; and, 3. That he may live: all which aſſertions are in direct contradiction to the tenets of Calvin. "If, therefore, (ſays Dr. Kipling,) Calvin's

doctrine

doctrine of predeſtination be true, the authors of our Prayer Book have put in the mouth of the prieſt a triple falſhood, to be pronounced by him in the houſe of prayer, and in the time of divine ſervice. And, if it be alſo true that theſe authors were Calviniſts, as Preſbyter and Mr. Overton have tried to demonſtrate, they directed thoſe falſhoods to be uttered 'in the ſight of God and in the face of the congregation,' themſelves believing them to be falſhoods; and conſequently were the moſt wicked and moſt impious men living. But they were not ſuch abandoned characters. And this paſſage affords alone and of itſelf an irrefragable proof that they were ſtrictly ſpeaking Anti-Calviniſts. For what more proper, or more effectual method, I aſk, could they poſſibly have taken, or could any one elſe have deviſed, to exclude Calviniſts from the reading deſk, than to require, as they have required, that every prieſt, whenever he officiates there, ſhall openly pronounce from it the following words; 'Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who deſireth not the death of a ſinner, but rather that he may turn from his wickedneſs and live'? That thoſe venerable divines have not completely ſucceeded in their laudable attempt, is not to be attributed to any weakneſs in themſelves, but to cauſes in others which no human foreſight and wiſdom can entirely guard againſt, namely, to mental derangement, an attachment to opinions early imbibed, which hoodwinks the underſtanding, and to deliberate wickedneſs." (Pp. 52—55.)

Mathematical demonſtration itſelf, is not clearer than that, on Calvin's principles of predeſtination, all prayer, for ſpiritual bleſſings at leaſt, is abſurd and ridiculous. To petition God for eternal life, or for any of thoſe previous means which lead to it, is to both the elect and reprobate equally uſeleſs: to the former, becauſe they cannot poſſibly miſs it; to the latter, becauſe they cannot poſſibly attain it. "But as no Calviniſt, (ſays Dr. Kipling,) is certain to what claſs he belongs, whether of elect or reprobates, ought not, it may be aſked, every Calviniſt, for this reaſon, and on this account, to petition God for ſalvation? My anſwer is, no. Every Calviniſt is certain of this, (certain, I mean, in his own mind,) that there is not a third deſcription of men; but that he muſt belong to one of thoſe claſſes: he is alſo certain that, if he was born a reprobate, let him pray for ſalvation ever ſo frequently, he cannot become an elect; and that, if he was born an elect, ſhould he never once pray for ſalvation, he cannot die a reprobate. He muſt, therefore, on due reflection, be convinced that, though he be uncertain of what claſs he is, yet, whichſoever he be of, praying to God for ſalvation cannot anſwer any purpoſe; and that ſuch a petition, in the mouth of any Calviniſt, whether reprobate or elect, is (to ſpeak of it in the mildeſt terms) egregious nonſenſe." (P. 57.)

This argument ſophiſtry may attempt to evade; but no powers of reaſoning will ever confute it. To command aſſent from every rational mind, it needs only to be attended to; and, in order that its force may be fully perceived, we have only to apply it, as our author has

has done, in particular inſtances, and obſerve what is really, on the principles of Calviniſtic predeſtination, the true, legitimate, and neceſſary import of any given petition. Let us take, for example, the ſupplication in the Litany; "From everlaſting damnation, good Lord deliver us." "If, (ſays Dr. Kipling,) our Liturgy and this doctrine be, as our adverſaries maintain they are, in perfect correſpondence and harmony, then by the pronouns, WE, US, wherever they occur in our Prayer Book, can be ſignified nothing elſe but a *Calviniſtic* congregation, either of elects or of reprobates, or of elects and reprobates, aſſembled to worſhip God. Subſtitute then, in the room of us, firſt theſe words, US ELECT; ſecondly, US REPROBATES; laſtly, 'us, a promiſcuous aſſemblage of elects and reprobates;' theſe being the only ſubſtitutions which, if Calvin's diviſion of mankind be right, can poſſibly be made. And ſhould the reſult of every one of theſe ſubſtitutions be ſome petition to Almighty God which is either nonſenſical, or cannot be complied with, it muſt be allowed that the deprecatory ſentence, which we are now comparing with Calviniſm, is utterly irreconcileable to it."

"By the firſt ſubſtitution, the clauſe under conſideration becomes this; 'From everlaſting damnation, good Lord, deliver us elect.' But theſe petitioners neither have been, nor are, nor ever can be, damned eternally."

"By the ſecond this; 'From everlaſting damnation, good Lord, deliver us reprobates.' But theſe Almighty God has *immutably* damned for ever: and *cannot* therefore, conſiſtently with the attribute of veracity, deliver from eternal damnation."

"By the third, this; 'From everlaſting damnation, good Lord, deliver us, a promiſcuous aſſemblage of elects and reprobates.' But four-fifths of this congregation are conſigned to damnation irrevocably."

"The folly of theſe petitions is obvious; and the concluſion to which they lead, is that this clauſe in our Liturgy can never have been intended for a congregation of *Calviniſts*." (Pp. 60—61.)

The moſt prominent features of Calvin's doctrine of predeſtination are theſe: 1. That the elect were, from all eternity, appointed to everlaſting felicity, not on account of any *foreſeen* worth or goodneſs of character, but merely becauſe ſuch was the ſovereign will and pleaſure of Almighty God. 2. That the reprobates, on the other hand, were, from all eternity, as irrevocably condemned to everlaſting miſery, not for any *foreſeen* worthleſsneſs or demerit of character, but ſolely becauſe God willed their damnation; ſo that the future condition of both, whether happy or miſerable, is in no reſpect, and in no degree, dependent on their behaviour here, but is the pure effect of God's arbitrary purpoſe, and immutable decree. 3. That, in his paſſage through the world, no man is free or accountable for his actions; but that all men are mere machines. "Unicus eſt. Deus qui efficit omnia in omnibus .... Electos ſuos præparat in gloriam .... Electi ſunt inſtrumenta vel organa, quibus miſericordiam ſuam exercet ...., Minime conſentaneum eſt præparationem ad interitum alio transferre, quam ad arcanum Dei conſilium .... Utraque præparatio ab arcano

Dei

Dei consilio pendet. . . . Reprobos Deus creavit, ut iræ organa forent." Hence Calvinism, as our author observes, entirely supersedes a future day of account, as described in Rev. xx. 12, 13. Nor is this a consequence which Calvin disowned; on the contrary, he expressly admitted, and attempted to defend it. (Inst. lib. ii. cap. xvi. 17, 18, and lib. iii. cap. xviii. 1, 2.) He did not, indeed, deny our Saviour's second advent. He thought, however, that the object of his coming will not be "to judge men according to their works," but, after simply separating the elect from the reprobates, "as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats," to send the former to heaven, and the latter to hell.

But, in the Athanasian Creed, we are taught to believe the momentous truth that, at our Lord's second coming, "ALL men shall GIVE ACCOUNT for their OWN WORKS." "I shall add, (says the Dean of Peterborough,) no comment. The irreconcileableness of this passage with the blasphemous dogmas of Calvin must strike the most careless reader. I cannot, however, help adding that, if the belief of a future reckoning, and of a subsequent state of rewards and punishments, be necessary, (and, in my opinion, it is absolutely necessary,) not merely to the well-being, but to the very being, of civil society; the greatest pest of civil society is he who preaches up Calvinism; and the next in degree is he who countenances such preaching publicly, and commends it in domestic circles. Let me further mention, (continues our author in allusion to a celebrated charge of the present excellent Bishop of St. Asaph,) what most certainly was not intended, but what experience has confirmed the truth of, that to compliment Calvin's memory in print, for a preface or dedication only, (so critical are the present times) is not altogether harmless, and that the public reprehension of *moral* sermons has occasioned much harm." The reflections which follow are so important, and so just, that we should be guilty of a shameful dereliction of our duty, if we withheld them from the public.

"It is a well-known fact, and is in no small degree attested by Presbyter and Mr. Overton,* that, in several parts of this country, the common people

---

* The Dean of Peterborough has here, in a note, preferred, against Mr. Overton, a charge which bears so serious an aspect, and so deeply affects his moral character, as, in our opinion, imperiously to demand a public refutation. "By way of demonstrating that so very general a desertion of our churches" really does exist, this writer has brought forward the following passage, "on one half of the Lord's day, good inclinations carry the more pious part of our parishioners to the conventicle; and the Devil invites those of another cast to the ale-house;" and for this passage has seemingly referred his readers to Bishop Pretyman's Charge, delivered in the year 1800. It certainly is not in this work; nor can it, I should think, be found in any other episcopal charge. As a general proposition, and this writer has quoted it as such, it is false. Is it the coinage of one person, ascribed by

people will ſcarce liſten to the ſermon of their pariſh-miniſter, unleſs the ſubject of it be ſome point of doctrine; and that all preaching on other ſubjects is ſneeringly ſpoken of as 'good moral preaching.' Should any perſon take the trouble to inquire and inform himſelf, what are the cauſes and the conſequences of this diſlike, he would find, I believe, on inquiry, firſt, that, in the pariſhes where this diſlike prevails, the common people are egregiouſly miſled in matters of religion, and miſled on this moſt important ſubject, not only by a numerous tribe of ſecular itinerants, but by ſome alſo of our regular clergy: ſecondly, that thoſe deluded and miſguided people, who thus expreſs their diſlike and contempt of 'moral preaching,' know juſt as much what it means as Mr. Wilkes's rabble, about the year 1765, underſtood of thoſe general warrants which they ſo vehemently exclaimed againſt, and no more: thirdly, that conſiderable pains have been taken of late to inform the commonalty of this land that *moral* ſermons have been reprobated by ſome of our biſhops in their charges: and, laſtly, that, if the miniſter of a pariſh perſeveres in his bounden duty of explaining to his pariſhioners the ten Commandments, and of preaching againſt all ſorts and all degrees of *immoral* conduct, ſuch of his congregation as have heard from thoſe ſtrolling preachers, 'who creep into houſes, and lead captive ſilly women laden with ſins,' that this is not goſpel-preaching, quit the eſtabliſhed church, and reſort to the conventicle; where they are ſure of not being moleſted with ſermons againſt *immorality*, and are aſſured of ſalvation by faith alone."

"Thoſe parts of the Epiſcopal Charges alluded to above, which are directed againſt moral preaching, and recommend doctrinal ſermons, have been culled, concentrated, and republiſhed by Mr. Overton. As no attack had been made upon this writer, (or indeed upon any one elſe,) either for neglecting to preach *moral* diſcourſes, or for dwelling in his ſermons on thoſe *doctrinal* topics, which the biſhops whom he has quoted have recommended it to us to inſiſt upon, it is not poſſible that thoſe parts of their lordſhips' charges ſhould have been brought forward by him for the purpoſe of defence. And not having any rank, or any authority, in the Church, nor having high rank in the republic of letters, he could not ſurely preſume, in this part of his work, to reprehend, dictate to, and charge the parochial clergy. What other view, then, could he poſſibly have in republiſhing thoſe dehortations and exhortations of the biſhops, than to extend ſtill farther the above-mentioned diſlike of practical diſcourſes in the pulpit, and to increaſe the number of ſchiſmatics in the nation?" (Pp. 65—73.)

For the Anti-Calviniſm of the Liturgy of our Church Dr. Kipling brings ſome unanſwerable arguments from the Office for the Miniſtration of Public Baptiſm. This ſacrament is manifeſtly a federal rite, the parties to which are Almighty God and the perſon baptized. In this covenant the perſon baptized engages to perform certain terms

---

by Mr. Overton in appearance to another, whoſe name would, in his opinion, give it currency in the nation?" We have not the Biſhop of Lincoln's Charge; but our readers will find the paſſage in page 405 of Mr. Overton's book: and the reference, undoubtedly, DOES SEEM to be as the Dean of Peterborough has aſſerted.

or conditions, which are therein ſpecified; and Almighty God, on the performance of theſe, engages to confer on him the ineſtimable reward of eternal life. But, according to the very eſſence of Calviniſm, neither the ſalvation of the elect, nor the damnation of the reprobate, is, in the ſmalleſt degree, dependent on terms or conditions: for both were unalterably fixed and determined, millions of ages before the perſons themſelves were born. But, were ſuch the ſtate and condition of man, "the miniſtration of baptiſm, as it is ſolemnized in our churches, would be," ſays our author, "an impious farce, and the officiating clergyman the principal performer in it."

So much with regard to the office in general; but our author farther ſhews that particular parts of it are decidedly at variance with the principles of Calvin. For 1. In the firſt prayer the miniſter beſeeches Almighty God that "He will mercifully look upon this child—that he may ſo paſs the waves of this troubleſome world, that finally he may come to the land of everlaſting life." But to this land Calvin's reprobates *can never come*; and his elect, being guided through thoſe waves by an omnipotent and omniſcient pilot, *cannot poſſibly miſs it*. If, therefore, Calviniſm be true, this prayer is nugatory.

2. In the exhortation ſucceeding the goſpel, the miniſter is directed to aſſure the ſponſors that our Saviour "will FAVOURABLY receive THIS PRESENT infant;" and a little after he expreſſes his perſuaſion of "the GOOD WILL of our heavenly Father towards this infant:" thus declaring a firm and rooted belief that both God the Father and God the Son, are *benevolently diſpoſed*, not towards a FEW, but towards EVERY infant who is, by baptiſm, grafted into the body of Chriſt's Church. "We have, therefore," ſays our author, "in this exhortation the moſt convincing proof imaginable that the Calviniſtic doctrines of predeſtination and election were totally diſbelieved by our reformers, and that to reconcile theſe doctrines with the Liturgy compoſed by them is a thing quite impoſſible."

3. But our author particularly calls our attention to the prayer by which the water is conſecrated, becauſe it determines, with the utmoſt certainty, a much diſputed and moſt important point, namely, what preciſe and definite idea thoſe illuſtrious perſons who founded our Church intended to expreſs, in the Liturgy and Articles, by the term ELECT. The words on which his reaſoning is founded are theſe: "Sanctify this water to the myſtical waſhing away of ſin; and grant that this child now to be baptized therein, may receive the fulneſs of thy grace, and ever *remain* in the number of thy faithful and *elect* children." From theſe words Dr. Kipling argues thus: It is indiſputably true that the words "THIS child" were intended to be ALIKE applicable to EVERY infant brought to the font for baptiſm; and it is equally indiſputable that the words "may REMAIN an elect" imply that the infant is made an elect when it is baptized. "It is, therefore, moſt certain, that by an ELECT of God thoſe founders underſtood EVERY perſon whom ſome miniſter duly commiſſioned

miſſioned has baptized into the Chriſtian faith; and that, conſequently, by election to eternal life they underſtood not, as Calvin did, the election of individuals, but the election of that body of people which is denominated Chriſt's Church." He ſubjoins, in a note, that as both Preſbyter and Mr. Overton have maintained that the doctrines of the Articles are transferred into the Liturgy, they "cannot deny that the elect of whom mention is made in this prayer of conſecration and the elect of whom a deſcription is given in the XVIIth Article, are one and the ſame claſs of perſons. Both of them muſt confeſs then that, by "thoſe whom God hath choſen in Chriſt out of mankind," and who are deſcribed more at large in this XVIIth Article, the framers of our Articles meant, not Calvin's few elect, but every one duly baptized in the Chriſtian faith; not *individuals*, whom God hath culled and ſegregated from among *Chriſtians*, but that *body* of Chriſtian people "whom he hath choſen out of *mankind*." This point being ſettled, it follows that by the words "our election in Chriſt," which occur in the ſecond part of the XVIIth Article, thoſe framers underſtood "the election of us Chriſtians;" and that, therefore, their meaning in this ſecond part is briefly this: "As the godly conſideration of the election of us Chriſtians is full of ſweet comfort to godly Chriſtians;—ſo for ungodly Chriſtians to have continually before their eyes the ſentence of God's predeſtination, is a moſt dangerous downfal." (Pp. 74—78.)

To this argument we cannot perceive on what principles either Mr. Overton or Preſbyter could reply. Dr. Kipling might have added that the words which he has quoted from the prayer of Conſecration, are utterly ſubverſive of another fundamental doctrine of Calviniſm, namely, "that the elect can never finally fall from grace, and periſh everlaſtingly." The infant is, undoubtedly, ſuppoſed, in the prayer, to be, by baptiſm, RECEIVED INTO THE NUMBER OF THE ELECT; and every one ſees that it were perfectly abſurd to pray that a perſon might REMAIN among thoſe, from whom, in conſequence of an immutable decree of God, it is abſolutely impoſſible that he ſhould ever SEPARATE.

Another invincible argument for the Anti-Calviniſm of our Church is deduced from ſuch precatory addreſſes as the following: "Give us grace that we may daily *endeavour ourſelves* to follow the bleſſed ſteps of his moſt holy life:" "*Aſſiſt* us mercifully, O Lord, in theſe our ſupplications and prayers:" "So *aſſiſt* us with thy grace, that we may do all ſuch good works as thou haſt prepared;" &c. "Now," ſays our author, "if *A* helps or aſſiſts *B*, muſt not *B* himſelf be doing, or at leaſt endeavouring to do, ſomething? Wherefore in theſe, and in all other ſupplications of a like nature, we pray to Almighty God for his *co-operating* grace. But Calvin poſitively denies that the grace of God ever does co-operate with us. From whence it will be evident that all prayers to Almighty God for the aſſiſtance, or help, or ſuccour, of his ſpirit, (of which very many may be found in our

Prayer Book,) militate againſt Calvin's theological ſyſtem." (Pp. 81, 82.)

We have thus given a very full analyſis of the Dean of Peterborough's maſterly publication, accompanied with ample and intereſting extracts, which diſplay, at once, the really "true Churchman," the logical reaſoner, and the ſound divine. We have ſeldom, in truth, had the good fortune to peruſe and recommend a performance of more genuine and ſterling merit; and our readers, undoubtedly, muſt have often obſerved that, in our notice of a work, the ſhare of attention which we beſtow on it, and the number of pages which we dedicate to it, are leſs proportioned to its ſize than to its importance. We ſhall now take our leave of the reſpectable author, after quoting, from his concluſion, for the admonition of our readers, eſpecially of ſuch of them, if any ſuch there be, as are Calviniſtic evangelical miniſters, or adherents of ſuch, the ſerious and weighty conſiderations which follow.

"It ſeems ſcarcely poſſible, for thoſe two gentlemen," ſays Dr. Kipling, ſpeaking of Mr. Overton and the anonymous Preſbyter, "when they aſſerted that our Church was founded by Calviniſts, and brought arguments in ſupport of this falſe aſſertion, not to have known that it was a deviation from the truth. The paſſages I have adduced to prove that thoſe venerable founders were not Calviniſts, are not taken from obſcure writings, nor from the unfrequented parts of books in common uſe; but from the pages moſt frequently read in Calvin's publications, and in our book of Common Prayer. Now Preſbyter and Mr. Overton had both of them, doubtleſs, before they preſumed to commence writers on Calviniſm, read at leaſt all thoſe paſſages in Calvin, which I have quoted from his works: and, being miniſters of the Church eſtabliſhed, they muſt both alſo, at that time, have been acquainted with its Liturgy and Articles. How then is it poſſible for either of them to have been ignorant of thoſe proofs drawn from Calvin and our Prayer Book?"

"I farther obſerve that they have not uttered this falſhood, and brought proofs in ſupport of it, the better to promote the ends for which they have *profeſſed* to compoſe their publications. Mr. Overton's profeſſed object is to inform the public by what diſcriminating tokens 'a true Churchman' is to be 'aſcertained;' and that of Preſbyter is 'to vindicate the Church of England.' But are we the better enabled to aſcertain one of thoſe SECTARIES by an aſſurance from their ring-leader that this Church was founded by Calviniſts? Or is the Church at all vindicated, by a declaration from one of its Preſbyters that its doctrinal Articles were compoſed by perſons whoſe minds were contaminated with Calvin's BLASPHEMIES? For ſuch are almoſt all his doctrines. Theſe cannot have been the motives which induced thoſe two writers to aſſert that the founders of our Church were Calviniſts."

"My laſt obſervation is that the conduct of thoſe writers has a moſt dangerous tendency. For to what purpoſe was this aſſertion made? In the firſt place to deduce this corollary from it, 'that the Articles of our Church are Calviniſtical;' and then to blacken the character of the national clergy, and obliterate from the minds of the people all reſpect and veneration for this ſacred order of men, by founding upon this corollary the

two

two following charges, 'that every miniſter of the Church eſtabliſhed, if he be not a Calviniſt, has both ſubſcribed to Articles which he does not believe, and omits alſo to preach thoſe doctrines which, when he was ordained, he was enjoined by authority, and ſolemnly engaged himſelf, to teach his congregation.' Theſe are neither of them novel calumnies. The itinerant preachers of methodiſm have long been telling the common people, that the miniſters of the Church eſtabliſhed, neither believe its Articles, nor preach the doctrines contained in them; and this latter accuſation they now weave into their pamphlets. Their views and purpoſes in diſſeminating thoſe falſe and calumnious reports have been, and ſtill are, to render the parochial clergy diſreſpected and contemptible in their ſeveral pariſhes, and to draw away the common people from the eſtabliſhed Church: and their indefatigable exertions in carrying on this wicked project have been, alas! in many places but too ſucceſsful; of all which this ERSTART SECT of 'true Churchmen' being fully ſenſible, *they* have now adopted, we ſee, the ſame iniquitous means, and begun to imitate this buſy, meddling, crafty, deſigning, miſchievous tribe o preachers. But let me remind the 'true Churchmen' ſo often mentioned by me, and not only theſe two, but every other 'evangelical miniſter,' and the preachers of methodiſm too, that, ſhould our Church be demoliſhed, the downfal of the ſtate, as hiſtory authorizes us to conclude, would not be far diſtant; and that of thoſe men who were the moſt active ſticklers for a diſſolution of government in France, not a few themſelves fell victims to that revolution which they had been ſo zealous and ſo eager to effectuate."

---

## Biſſet's *Hiſtory of the Reign of George III.*

(*Continued from p.* 359.)

THE firſt act of the Grenville adminiſtration was the proſecution of Wilkes, which our author allows to have been imprudent, but denies it to have been arbitrary. He now proceeds to ſchemes that peculiarly reſulted from Mr. Grenville, his financial projects, and eſpecially his ſcheme of taxing America, with the efforts produced in the different colonies from that ſcheme. Our author carefully marks a difference of character between the northern, the middle, and the ſouthern colonies, that he had noticed in his Introduction, and which accounts for the firſt taking the lead in oppoſition to the mother country. Our hiſtorian returning to Europe affords a bird's-eye proſpect of the ſtate of the ſeveral powers of the Continent chiefly connected with Britain, and touches on the riſing ſpirit of liberty in France. He now returns to Britain, and opens Mr Grenville's plan of raiſing ſtamp duties from America. Preparatory to this diſcuſſion he unfolds the principles and ſyſtem of Britiſh colonization, and adopts the views of Mr. Burke regarding taxation as a queſtion of expediency more than of abſolute right; and in the following ſhort paſſage unfolds the principles and reaſonings which he afterwards applies to the more advanced ſtages of the American conteſt.

"The actual benefits that accrued to England from her colonies, consisted in the increase of people, as the means of security and productiveness were augmented; and in the vast and rapidly growing accession to our trade, to supply the wants of the multiplying colonies. Commercial benefits were the objects of the plantations; the question, therefore, to be considered simply was, How are these advantages to be most effectually promoted, insured, and improved? It was a mere question of EXPEDIENCY, requiring no metaphysical disquisitions about abstract right. Experience shewed that our gains had been very considerable, and acquired without murmur or dispute, by the old plan, of profiting from their commerce, and demands for our productions: wisdom had now to determine, whether an adherence to a system of experienced benefit daily increasing, or the adoption of new schemes of doubtful operation and certain opposition, was most likely to continue and extend that benefit for which colonies were established. The British minister preferred the untried theory to the essayed plan."

He now proceeds to the Stamp Act; the arguments for and against it, and its effects in America: thence he goes on to the Regency bill, and the dismission of the Grenville administration. He mentions the charge against Mr. Grenville as being the tool of Lord Bute and the votary of arbitrary power. For these two assertions our historian denies that there was any evidence; and though he disapproves both of the prosecution of Wilkes and the scheme of American taxation as impolitic and inexpedient, he regards Mr. Grenville as a statesman of integrity and fair intentions. In this part of the narrative Dr. Bisset considers the allegation of an interior cabinet which governed the country; there being no evidence that such a secret influence existed, he very properly reprobates it as an historical fact, though he mentions it as a current report which greatly agitated the public. Adhering to this principle of governing without any respect of party, the king made offers to Mr. Pitt, who insisted on such terms as his majesty did not deem expedient to allow even to Mr. Pitt. There remained only the party of the Marquis of Rockingham, who now was at the head of the whig confederacy; through the agency of the King's uncle, the Duke of Cumberland, an administration composed of the whig confederacy was formed; but the death of his Royal Highness soon after deprived the new cabinet of his support. The state of affairs in America drew the chief attention of administration. A vehement opposition commenced in New England to the Stamp Act, and, though with less violence, extended to other colonies; and a system of combination began throughout the provinces.

There were three classes of opinion in the British parliament concerning America. The Grenville party, the devisers of American taxation, and the framers of the stamp act, insisted on coercive measures. Mr. Pitt and his adherents disavowed the right of taxing America, and proposed to be satisfied with the revenue derived from her by commerce. Ministers chose a middle course; to reserve the right, but relinquish the measure, of which the colonies complained. They

accord-

accordingly introduced a prefatory bill, declaring that Britain had no right to tax America; and another bill propoſed the repeal of the Stamp Act. On the ſubject of American taxation he embodies into his narrative the ſubſtance of the arguments that were uſed for and againſt American taxations; but without deſcending from the dignity of hiſtory to the prolix details of parliamentary citation, that ſwell out hiſtorical works, which we lately and formerly have had occaſion to obſerve. Following the Rockingham miniſtry through the ſeries of their acts, our author conſiders them as men of fair intentions, but totally unfit for their ſituations; and for this plain reaſon, which the Doctor expreſſes with his uſual clearneſs and ſtrength: in the moſt important offices there were neither great talents, political knowledge, nor official experience. From this weakneſs he very naturally and fairly deduces their exceſſive eagerneſs to catch popularity.—"They wiſhed," he ſays, "to pleaſe all parties; a ſentiment indicating more of an amiable diſpoſition than of profound wiſdom, and leading to indeciſive and conſequently ineffectual meaſures." Here we muſt obſerve that Dr. B. poſſeſſes in a conſiderable degree that ſpecies of excellence in narrative which combines hiſtorical truth on the particular ſubject with philoſophical juſtneſs of eſtimation, and which extends the application to any other ſubject of the kind.—What he ſays, at once deſcribes the miniſters in queſtion, and deſcribes any other miniſters who, conſcious of inefficacy, ſtrain after popularity. His ſummary of that cabinet concludes in the following words. "It will be difficult to find in the hiſtory of miniſters, a ſet of men more reſpectable for private characters, or more inefficient as public ſervants, than the Marquis of Rockingham's adminiſtration." Our author now takes a view of the affairs of India, which he brings down to the period when the Engliſh obtained the collection of the revenue.

His Majeſty ſtill deſirous of having an adminiſtration that ſhould have no regard to party, empowered Mr. Pitt to form a miniſtry. The ſtateſman propoſed Lord Temple to be firſt commiſſioner of the treaſury; but that nobleman, being now politically connected with his brother, wiſhed for a greater ſhare of power to the Grenville ſupporters than Mr. Pitt thought expedient; and, as they could not agree on the terms of the other appointments, his lordſhip would not accept of the proffered office. The Duke of Grafton was made firſt lord of the treaſury; and from that circumſtance the new cabinet received the name of the Grafton adminiſtration. Mr. Pitt himſelf took the privy ſeal, but was regarded as the head of his Majeſty's council. He was now called to the upper Houſe, by the title of Earl of Chatham: his acceptance of a peerage leſſened his popularity, but is vindicated by our hiſtorian.

"If," ſays he, "the caſe be impartially conſidered, the firſt man of his age and country accepting high rank, affords no ground for cenſure. On the verge of ſixty, and oppreſſed with bodily infirmity, he had become leſs

fit than formerly for the vehement and contentious eloquence of the House of Commons. His wisdom and patriotism might operate in the upper as well as in the lower House; and the office which he held in administration had no connection with one house more than with the other. There is nothing inconsistent with true greatness, in desiring to found a family; and the peerage can never receive more honourable accessions, than from those who have exerted distinguished ability in performing eminent services."

In the following session of parliament the late acquisitions in India and the affairs of the East India Company were taken into consideration; a very important doctrine was delivered by Lord Chatham, which though not immediately adopted in practice was afterwards the ground-work of grand political regulation. He "denied the right of the Company to have territorial possessions, as such were not conveyed by their charters, and were totally foreign to the nature and object of a trading corporation. Even if it were legally just, and politically expedient, that an associated body of merchants should be sovereigns of these extensive dominions, the great expence of government in the protection of that company entitled it to the revenues, for the purpose of indemnification." The question was discussed theoretically; but the territories and revenues were left in the possession of the Company. Unfortunately the Earl of Chatham was in such a state of health as prevented his political efficiency: Mr. Townshend proposed a new plan of taxing America, restricting the duties to certain imports. Our historian censures this proposition as inexpedient and tending to irritate the colonists without being efficiently productive to British finance. "If," he says, "America afforded, through our manufactures and trade, a very great revenue, as could be and was proved, it was a puerile policy to hazard its productiveness, rather than let glass and pasteboard be duty free, and pay for our soldiers the cost of their salt, vinegar, and small-beer. There was a littleness in a considerable part of our proceedings respecting America, as inconsistent with the dignity of a powerful, as with the policy of a wise nation." Presenting a short view of affairs on the continent, our author notices the spirit of resistance to the authority of the monarch, which was spreading in France; exhibits the King of Prussia equally great in political œconomy as in government and war; and opens the character and measures of the Empress of Russia, and of Joseph of Germany. Proceeding to the south of Europe, he mentions the expulsion of the Jesuits; and, without venerating that fraternity, disapproves of the confiscation of their property as totally inconsistent with justice, and, in enmity to clerical orders, finds commencing symptoms of infidelity.

Lord Chatham now took no concern in administration; Mr. Townshend was dead, ministry was weak and distracted, and the people were discontented. The session of parliament 1767-8, was short and unimportant; and on the 10th of March parliament was dissolved. Having brought the first parliament of his Majesty to a close, he carries the affairs of Ireland to the same period, and

closes

closes the first volume with the octennial law, and the joy it caused in Ireland.

Wise and liberal as was the policy of our king, which sought to govern by virtue and ability instead of a party confederacy, it had not hitherto attained the merited success. The royal plan had to encounter obstacles which partly arose from particular incidents and characters, but were chiefly owing to general causes. The enumeration of these causes commences the second volume: the long supremacy of the whig combination had, in the opinion of many, conferred on that body a prescriptive right to govern. Aware of this prevalent sentiment when Mr. Pitt first invaded their monopoly, he did not seek entirely to exclude the phalanx; but without admitting their command enjoyed their assistance. The Earl of Bute had not talents and still less popularity, for overbearing the whig confederacy in the public estimation. Both the internal and colonial policy of his successors were either unpopular or inefficient, and the respective administrations were conceived by most Englishmen to be tools of the Earl of Bute. The mercantile body always connected with the whigs, were inimical to government, which they fancied to be directed by their enemies; and farther dissatisfied with the measures adopted towards America that proved so detrimental to trade. These general causes an individual case called into turbulent action; perfectly appreciating the character of Mr. Wilkes, our author, nevertheless, blames the conduct of ministry, not as illegal and unconstitutional, but as feeble and irresolute.

"Prudence," he says, "dictated determined measures, either of rigour or of lenity. If they resolved on severe justice, by immediately enforcing his sentence of outlawry, this could have driven him back to banishment, and for ever crushed his projects either of ambition or revenge: if the more magnanimous and wiser alternative of mercy had been adopted by a full pardon, his influence and popularity would have ceased with the prosecution from which they sprung. But ministers embraced half measures, the usual offspring of imbecility, and the parent of disappointment."

He follows the proceedings respecting Wilkes to the meeting of parliament, and the riots in St. George's Fields. From internal he passes to foreign affairs, and gives an etching of the causes that led to the rupture between Turkey and Russia. Before he returns to Britain, he takes a view of the American colonies; the discontents that there prevailed, and the non-importation agreements. The New Englanders took the lead in turbulence, and rose even to outrage and riot. In Britain dissatisfaction was increasing, being ardently promoted by political agitators: and here again we see how happily our author unites narrative with generalization. "Whoever," he says, "proposes popularity as his chief object, well knows that he must keep alive the public attention. Wilkes and his supporters were thoroughly skilled in the *machinery* of political notoriety, and spent a great part of the recess in holding meetings, clubs, and parties, framing resolutions, remonstrances, and pamphlets." This account,

account, so truly describing the conduct of those demagogues, with equal justice would apply to Sir Francis Burdett or any other noisy and mischievous demagogue. Wilkes principally occupied parliament during 1769. In this session ministers procured against the colonies the revival of trials within the realm for treason beyond sea. Our author, as before, regards the policy towards America as unwise and of the same rash and weak character that stamped their half measures concerning Wilkes. It was, he says, feeble anger, which provoked without intimidating its objects. The history now conducts us to India, and introduces Hyder Ally and the first unsuccessful war carried on by the Company. In Europe at this time the chief object of attention was the gallant defence of Corsica and the annexation of that island to France. In America discontents continued, but still with the greatest violence in the northern colonies. Wilkes and the Middlesex election raised a flame in England; and such a subject of political contest naturally produced literary discussion. Our author impartially presents the reasonings on both sides; and thinks, with Johnson, it might have been politically expedient that expulsion should be a bar to re-eligibility; but agrees with Junius that there neither existed law nor precedent that precluded the re-election of an expelled member. There follows an analysis of the objects which Junius pursued, connected with the antecedent part of the history, and the means which he employed; with an estimate of his literary and political character. This review displays a thorough comprehension of Junius both as a partizan and a writer; and very fully evinces the political and critical penetration of the author. It is much too long for citation, and too closely compacted for extract. The following passage, however, may serve as a sample.

"For clearness, precision, and force of style, select phraseology, dexterous arrangement, impressiveness of manner, giving the materials the most pointed effect, these productions have rarely been exceeded, and not often equalled, by political publications; but he who should look into Junius for a close chain of antecedents and consequents, facts, and legitimate inferences, will be disappointed, by seeking for what the author never intended to bestow, and what would not have answered his purpose. Junius COULD reason clearly and strongly; but he did not constantly argue conclusively, because his object was, not to enlighten the understanding, but to inflame the passions. He gratified the people by repeating to them, in strong and nervous language, their own notions and feelings: he pleased them not by the justness of performance, but by dexterously chiming their favourite tunes."

Pursuing the internal narrative, our author brings it to the resignation of the Duke of Grafton, and the commencement of Lord North's administration. The Middlesex election continued chiefly to engross parliament and the public. America, however, occupied a portion of legislative attention. Lord North proposed to repeal all duties on America, except on tea, and his propositions were adopted. This our author regards as merely a temporising expedient to

please

pleaſe both parties, and as an omen of his miniſterial character, that diſplayed meritorious intention without that combination of wiſdom and firmneſs that conſtitutes a beneficial ſtateſman. We are next conducted to the war between Ruſſia and Turkey, in which Britain took an intereſt; thence to the diſpute with Spain, about Falkland's Iſland, and its adjuſtment. America was become more tranquil: in England diſcontents continued to prevail, and produced the noted remonſtrances of the city of London. Our author beſtows the due praiſe on the dignified anſwer of the ſovereign, and the juſt cenſure on the indecorous reply of Beckford. The ſeſſion 1770-1 was chiefly occupied by diſcuſſions concerning the liberties of the preſs, and the rights of juries, occaſioned by proſecutions on charges on ſeditious libels. It was much more remarkable for contentious violence of debate than important enactment. Our author now follows the colonial policy of the new miniſter to America: in the middle and ſouthern colonies tranquillity was reſtored; but in the north diſcontent ſtill prevailed. Here Dr. B. ſtrongly marks the diverſity between the views of the New Englanders and their ſouthern neighbours.

"The coloniſts of Maſſachuſetts ſpoke and acted as members of independent communities; and the general tenour of their conduct manifeſted a diſpoſition to ſeparate from Great Britain as ſoon as a favourable opportunity ſhould offer. The conceſſions which tranquilliſed their ſouthern brethren, only ſerved to render thoſe turbulent republicans more inſolent and violent. Had the Britiſh miniſtry accurately ſtudied the diverſity of provincial character, and employed able, popular, and eloquent men, to court and conciliate the ſouthern and middle colonies, counteract the arts of the northern emiſſaries, and detach the votaries of monarchy from the abettors of republicaniſm, it is by no means improbable that they might have prevented the revolt from being general; and, if they had effected that great purpoſe, they would have had little difficulty in compelling, by vigour and deciſion, the democratical agitators of Maſſachuſett's to perform the duties of Britiſh ſubjects: but no ſuch experiment was tried."

In England diſcontents began to ſubſide; the parliament in 1772 was leſs occupied in contention than for ſeveral years. The chief ſubjects that occupied them were queſtions of general policy, applications from diſſenters, the arguments for and againſt which our author preſents with his uſual clearneſs and impartiality. Two claſſes in parliament oppoſed the application, one on theological the other on political grounds. The author is a friend to liberty, but it is to liberty as guarded by the Britiſh conſtitution of church and ſtate, and is adverſe to change in the exiſting eſtabliſhments. He approves therefore of the rejection of the application. His narrative of the marriage law ſtrongly exhibits the arguments both for and againſt that propoſition; but he delivers no opinion himſelf on the ſubject. "Whether (he ſays) the law be wiſe or unwiſe is another queſtion; but the fact is, that without compliance with this ſtatute, no perſon ſo circumſtanced can be lawfully married, not have legi-

timate

timate offspring." When our author comes to the death of the Princeſs Dowager of Wales he beſtows the juſt praiſe on her private virtues, and affirms that no proof has ever been adduced to juſtify the charge of ſecret influence which has ſo often been alledged againſt her and her ſuppoſed partizans; therefore, though the report was generally credited, "an authentic hiſtorian, having neither oral nor written teſtimony, cannot record as a fact the exiſtence of ſuch an influence."

Our author with merited ſeverity deſcribes the diſmemberment of Poland, and marks iniquity, as a Britiſh moraliſt, without regarding the high rank of the perpetrators. He juſtly ſtigmatizes the Queen Dowager of Denmark for her infamous machinations againſt Matilda. The report that ſhe ſpread to the injury of the Queen's reputation being, he ſays, "never ſeconded either by teſtimony or circumſtantial evidence, muſt ſtand in hiſtory as a FALSE AND MALICIOUS SLANDER againſt the ſiſter of the Britiſh ſovereign." The year 1772 was noted for bankruptcies, of which Dr. B. gives an account which ſhews him to be well acquainted with the ſtate of mercantile tranſactions. The mercantile character had changed and become infected by ſtock-jobbing, fictitious credit, and adventurers without capital. In this account there is a ſhort ſketch of Alexander Fordyce. Our hiſtorian now carries us to the ſtate of Britiſh India, as made known through a committee of the Houſe of Commons that ſat during the ſummer. He ſtrongly reprobates the oppreſſions and frauds committed by ſervants, but here and in other parts of the hiſtory he aſſigns theſe abuſes to the want of a controul.

"The miſconduct of the company's officers, with all its conſequences, was manifeſtly imputable to the want of an efficient controul, proportionate to the vaſt powers with which they were neceſſarily entruſted. In the preſent ſituation of affairs, therefore, it was the buſineſs of the legiſlature to eſtabliſh a controul, which, leaving to ſervants every power neceſſary for the objects of their employment, ſhould only reſtrain malverſation."

The ſeſſion 1773 was occupied principally in a ſyſtem for the regulation of India, and the relief of the company. Of this ſcheme our author gives a conciſe but full account; preſenting the affairs of the continent he mentions the attacks of the Roman Catholic powers on the clergy. "An undue contempt (he ſays) of eccleſiaſtics was a favourite ſentiment with princes and miniſters in thoſe countries wherein they had very recently been regarded with undeſerved admiration: thoſe notions, very naturally, in the uſual courſe of human opinion, running into oppoſite extremes, accelerated the progreſs of infidelity; and, in their remote conſequences, precipitated the downfal of their abettors." In America the ſouthern and middle provinces were tranquil, and the northern turbulent. In Britain diſcontent and licentiouſneſs had ſubſided; trade and finance flouriſhed. Lord North was now at the zenith of his reputation. Such was the ſituation of affairs at the commencement of 1774. The narrative

now

now traces the cauſes and commencement of the American war. On this ſubject our author, as before, chiefly conſiders expediency, and rarely touches upon the right: where he does incidentally mention that point, he verges to the opinion of thoſe who think that Britain had no right to tax America, becauſe the colonies were not repreſented in parliament. Here we do not agree with Dr. Biſſet, but we muſt admit that throughout he is ſtrictly impartial, and bends no fact to maintain his poſitions. The conduct of miniſters and parliament he regards as impolitic. The firſt ſource of miniſterial error was the want of correct and full information. They only heard one ſide, and from that partial knowledge formed plans of the higheſt moment, which parliament too haſtily adopted. Under this impreſſion our author cenſures the ſeries of laws which were enacted during the year 1774. He now attends the Britiſh ſyſtem of policy to its effects in America; deſcribes the ferment through the provinces, the reſolutions of the provincial aſſemblies, the concert of the ſeveral colonies, the meeting and conduct of the general congreſs. He returns to Britain, and the impreſſion produced in this country by the conteſt, with the diſſolution of parliament. Prefatory to the account of the new parliament is a view of the leading characters which ſhews him no leſs thoroughly acquainted with the perſons who preſided in the deliberation than the ſeries of the narrative proves him acquainted with the ſubjects on which they were to deliberate. He is a profound admirer of Mr. Fox, much as he differs from him in many of his opinions; and here we ſhall take occaſion to obſerve, that our hiſtorian appears to lay rather too much ſtreſs on the mere poſſeſſion of ſuperior genius, that is as natural for a man of talents as for an opulent man to lay too much ſtreſs on riches; but both are wrong: he rather ſhades the defects of Fox; and even when he cenſures him, it is the cenſure of regret and not of ſeverity. We cannot help ſuſpecting that different as they have been in their political principles our hiſtorian has a fondneſs for Fox; but in this part of the hiſtory his favourite hero is the Earl of Chatham. We much approve of our author's parliamentary narrative; he has evidently choſen Hume for his model, and exhibits his ſubjects in a connected ſeries as an hiſtorian, not in detached compilations like a reporter of debates. Here we ſhall inſtitute no compariſon between Dr. Biſſet and Mr. Belſham, &c. becauſe it would be to him a degradation, and to them a ſneer. Our author exhibits a ſhort view of the literary efforts that were made on the diſpute with America, and though no man can have a deeper impreſſion of either the intellectual or moral worth of Dr. Johnſon, he does not appear ſufficiently to value the political efforts of that extraordinary man. We agree in his opinion on the works of Mr. Burke on that ſubject. "The productions (he ſays) of Mr. Burke on theſe ſubjects, exhibit to the hiſtorical reader a clear and complete view of what had been our policy towards America, and what had been the conſequences; what then was our policy, and what then were the actual and probable conſequences.

quences. They alſo preſent to the political philoſophers perſpicuous and forcible reaſoning upon the ſyſtem which government had adopted." From oppoſition to the American war our author traces the firſt riſe of diſquiſitions and doctrines of a very miſchievous tendency.

"Doctors Prieſtley and Price, (he ſays) diſſenting miniſters of very great ability and eminence, refining on the ſpeculations of the illuſtrious Locke, formed theories of civil and religious liberty totally incapable of being reduced to practice in any ſociety of human beings, as far as experience aſcertains to us the qualities and capacities of man; and tending, by holding up viſionary models of polity, to render the votaries of theſe writers diſſatisfied with the exiſting eſtabliſhments. Thus the oppoſition to the plans reſpecting America, though hitherto defenſible on conſtitutional grounds, gave riſe to diſcuſſions productive of viſionary and dangerous doctrines, which eventually promoted very unconſtitutional conduct."

Theſe principles in their advance our author does not fail to attend and expoſe. He now carries us to America, and purſues the ferment of diſcontent to inſurrection and revolt, and farther expoſes the imperfect information on which miniſters both planned and executed. Their coercive ſyſtem proceeded on a total miſinformation as to the diſpoſitions of the people: the force that was to carry it into effect was prepared under the ſame impreſſion, and alſo on a ſuppoſition that the Americans were cowards: ſuch an abſurd and improbable idea of courſe proved erroneous, and the campaign of 1775, from the want of adequate preparation, was neceſſarily unſucceſsful. In Britain the great majority was favourable to the miniſterial ſyſtem. At the commencement of the ſeſſion 1775-6 our author exhibits in one view the reaſoning of miniſters and oppoſition, on the diſpute with America, which precludes the neceſſity of ſubſequent repetition. Purſuing the parliamentary hiſtory, he exhibits the different parts of Meſſrs. Burke and Fox, naturally originating in their reſpective characters.

"The tranſcendent genius of Meſſrs. Burke and Fox, though exerciſed on every ſubject that came before parliament, had two different fields in which they reſpectively diſplayed their greateſt excellence. The legiſlative plans propoſed by oppoſition, projects of conciliation, and other ſchemes of deliberative policy, requiring the union of accurate and extenſive detail, with confirmed habits of generalization, were moſt frequently the productions of Mr. Burke. Diſcuſſions of executorial plans, and concile inquiries concerning ſpecific meaſures, requiring alſo energy of intellect, firmneſs and deciſion of temper, but without demanding ſuch a compaſs of general knowledge, or at leaſt equal habits of philoſophic contemplation, came chiefly from Mr. Fox. Mr. Burke, watching over legiſlation, might be called the lawgiver; and Mr. Fox, over executive meaſures and conduct, the ſtateſman of oppoſition."

No character, counſels, or meaſures does our author more thoroughly comprehend than thoſe of Lord North in detail, operation, and reſult; of good abilities, ready eloquence, and fair intentions, but without

without firmneſs; wavering and irreſolute in policy; though upright himſelf, ſuffering unexampled corruption in others, and exhibiting a leſſon of the little avail of ingenuity and amiable qualities, without energy and reſolution in conducting arduous affairs. For the campaign 1776 mighty armies were levied; the objects were three; to recover Canada, and invade the colonies through the lakes; to make an impreſſion on the ſouthern provinces, and to undertake an expedition to New York; theſe purpoſes our author ſucceſſively purſues in a narrative that is circumſtantial without being prolix.—We are particularly pleaſed with the cloſe chain of facts in the account of Howe's operations; and though Dr. B. chiefly confines himſelf to narration in this part of the work, and rarely cenſures General Howe directly, yet the narrative is a very ſevere cenſure of the commander in chief. Returning to Britain, the hiſtory gives, as uſual, the ſtate of the public mind at the commencement of parliament, and exhibits parliamentary proceedings according to the plan which we have before mentioned. In the account of the treatment of Lord Pigot, which that year came under conſideration of parliament, our author ſtrongly evinces his power of conveying moral reprobation in a mere narrative.

"On the 24th of Auguſt, 1776, Colonel Stuart ſpent the day at the houſe of Lord Pigot, and was entertained with all the cordiality that a hoſt could exert to a viſitant whom he thought his ſincere and affectionate friend. The gueſt, complaining of the exceſſive heat of the fortreſs, and obſerving his entertainer alſo affected by it, adviſed him to ſpend the night at a villa belonging to the governor, and, as an inducement, offered to accompany him in the excurſion. The governor being perſuaded, they ſet out together: when they were beyond the precincts of the fort, his lordſhip, according to the concert of his gueſt and profeſſed friend with his avowed enemies, was met by an officer and a party of ſeapoys, rudely and violently dragged out of the chaiſe, carried priſoner to the Mount, and ſtrongly guarded."

Our author, in this part of his hiſtory, places in a very ſtrong light the prophetic wiſdom of the Earl of Chatham, reſpecting the conduct of France and Spain. Croſſing to America, our hiſtorian in a few lines preſents to us the occupations of General Howe during winter.

"General Howe himſelf enjoyed every luxury at New York which he could have found in the metropolis of Britain: his favourite occupation was gaming; a paſtime in which many of his young officers became thoroughly initiated. Here were routs, balls, and aſſemblies in great abundance; ſo that the head-quarters bore the appearance of a gay and voluptuous city in the time of peace, rather than a military ſtation for watching and annoying the enemy in war. Such were the purſuits of the Britiſh commander from December to June."

As a contraſt to theſe *amuſements* of the Britiſh general, our author introduces the EMPLOYMENT of Waſhington, who at the ſame period

period trained and disciplined his army. Dr. B. pursues his former mode in the narrative of this campaign, and after an accurate account of the many and various operations under Gen. Howe, he ends with the following summary: "They closed a campaign, with few parallels in military history, for uniting efficiency of force and multiplicity of operation with futility of result. Such must impartial history transmit to posterity the warfare of Gen. Howe in America." The account of Gen. Burgoyne is accurate, and, as the difficulties increase, to a British reader interesting and pathetic. Having brought the American war to the treaty at Saratoga, our author takes a view of Irish affairs, and afterwards of Scottish, which he respectively brings to the same period, and here the second volume closes.

*(To be continued.)*

---

*The Trial of John Peltier, Esq. for a Libel against Napoleon Buonaparté, First Consul of the French Republic, at the Court of King's Bench, Middlesex, on Monday the 21st of February, 1803. Taken in Short-hand by Mr. Adams, and the Defence revised by Mr. Mackintosh.* 8vo. Pp. 496. 12s. Peltier, 14, Piccadilly. 1803.

WE have ever considered this trial of Mr. Peltier as involving questions of the first importance, both of a political and a legal nature;—as affecting the public characters of the persons by whose directions and advice the trial was instituted; and as much more materially affecting the inestimable right of free discussion, the genuine liberty of the British press. The evil consequences to Mr. Peltier himself have, by circumstances easily foreseen, been fortunately averted; but still the principles advanced and maintained as well by the counsel for the Crown, as by the Chief Justice of the King's Bench, cannot vary with any circumstances, but must have a fixed and permanent effect. These, therefore, it is of the utmost consequence to every British writer, and indeed to the cause of truth itself, to examine with the greatest strictness and attention, that, if sound, they may be universally understood, and, if unsound, their fallacy may be exposed to the world. It is not, however, the immediate province of a critic, nor, indeed, would the limits of a Review admit of it, to enter into a full and minute investigation of a subject so highly important in its nature and so greatly comprehensive in its effects; we can only therefore take a general view of it and point out its prominent features, for the purpose of calling the attention of other writers to a more accurate and ample discussion of it.

In a well-written *Introduction* Mr. Peltier states some of the difficulties under which he laboured, and some of the disadvantages to which he was exposed. He tells us, that he could not avail himself of his privilege as a foreigner to have a jury *de medietate linguæ*, half Frenchmen, though it was of the greatest consequence to him to have such a jury, that the libellous words, which were in the French language,

guage, ſhould not be ſubjected to a falſe interpretation; becauſe all the Frenchmen in London having ſuch connexions in France, with a proſpect either of returning to that country at ſome future period, or of deriving ſome advantage from it, in the way of inheritance, or otherwiſe, an acquittal by any of them would have been tantamount to a ſentence of death upon themſelves, in the event of their return, or, at leaſt, "a decree of perpetual exile in the dominions of his Majeſty." Another difficulty of which Mr. P. complains, is the prejudice excited againſt him, by the general idea which, he ſays, prevailed in the city, that his acquittal would lower the funds five per cent., from being conſidered in France as tantamount to a declaration of war. Such extraordinary circumſtances as theſe were certainly well calculated to excite a conſiderable degree of anxiety in the mind of a foreigner; and though, we are perſuaded, they would have no effect on a Britiſh jury, yet, we think, they ought to have had ſome influence on the minds of thoſe perſons by whom the proſecution was ordered to be inſtituted.

The indictment next follows, and fills ſix and thirty pages. One charge which it contains is truly curious; it is for intending to bring Napoleone Buonaparté into great hatred and contempt among the liege ſubjects of our Lord the King!!!—A pretty kind of crime indeed for his Majeſty's Attorney General to charge a man with, is that of ſeeking to make his ſubjects deſpiſe and hate a notorious aſſaſſin, a wretch ſtained with more crimes than any human being whoſe name is recorded in the page of hiſtory! To inſpire foreigners, at leaſt, with hatred of ſuch enormities, was, certainly, in a religious and moral ſenſe, highly meritorious in Mr. Peltier; and as it could not be neceſſary, we conceive, to the validity of the indictment or the ſucceſs of the proſecution, to charge the defendant with ſuch an act as this, common decency might, we ſhould have thought, have preſcribed its omiſſion.

The next point which attracts our notice, in this publication, is the *threat* contained in the outſet of the Attorney General's ſpeech, which appears to us alike *unprofeſſional* and *indecorous*. "If I could, for a moment, ſuppoſe, that my learned friend would lend himſelf in any degree to the ſpirit with which his client has edited and compoſed the publication, which I proſecute; if I could ſuppoſe for a moment, it would ſerve the intereſts of his client to defend him, as it were, by the republication of the very libel I charge againſt him; if I could ſuppoſe he would be inſtructed by his client to come into this court, and in obedience to thoſe inſtructions to go over, as it were, the ſame topics of declamation which this publication preſents to you, then undoubtedly there would be found an abundant and extenſive field for his ſplendid talents, furniſhed by one of the moſt extraordinary and eventful epochs of the moſt eventful and extraordinary revolution" (only *eventful* and *extraordinary*?—What wonderful liberality and forbearance are here diſplayed in the ſelection of epithets, to characterize this black æra of blood and crime!) "that

ever the hiſtory of mankind has recorded. But, gentlemen, I cannot think, if there were no other conſideration, and I think there are other conſiderations which will influence my learned friend:" (Did Mr. Attorney General ſuppoſe that his learned friend was caſting a ſheep's eye at the office of Solicitor General, and therefore threw out this gentle hint?) "but if there were no other conſideration but that of ordinary diſcretion, that is not the courſe he will be led to purſue. I ſay diſcretion will be ſufficient to guard us both againſt purſuing that courſe — — — — if you ſhould go along with me in thinking the defendant guilty of that charge, when the queſtion ſhall come for conſideration, what the puniſhment ſhall be on the perſon who is found guilty; if it ſhould occur to my learned friend, from the inſtructions of his client, that the legal proceedings of the firſt court of juſtice in this country ſhall be made the vehicle of *ſlander*," (Is the Attorney General to learn that the eſſence of *ſlander* is *falſhood*, that a *ſlanderer* is "one who *belies* another:" and that the libel which he proſecuted, and the repetition of which he here deprecates, contained no falſhood?

"To me belongs
The care to ſhun the blaſt of *ſland'rous* tongues,
Let malice, prone the *virtuous* to defame,
Thus with vile cenſure taint my *ſpotleſs* name."

Or did he mean to ſay that the *ſland'rous* tongue of Mr. Peltier had tainted the *ſpotleſs* name of the *virtuous* Napoleone Buonaparté?) But to proceed with his threat—"and giving greater weight and extenſion to the libel I proſecute" (The Court, he knew, might forbid the publication of the trial, and ſo avert this mighty evil)—"I think I ſhould ill diſcharge my duty to the public—that I ſhould ill diſcharge my duty to the honour and the character of the Engliſh adminiſtration of law, if I did not preſs it to the conſideration of the Court in inflicting that puniſhment."—There is not a republican in the kingdom, we venture to aſſert, who would not fully agree with Mr. Attorney in his definition of *duty*. If the libel had been directed againſt the King and conſtitution of this country, the general principle here advanced would have been fairly applied; but the attempt to apply it to ſuch a caſe as this was prepoſterous, and could be conſidered in no other light, by any national, unprejudiced, man, than as a ſop to Cerberus—the *provoco ad Conſulem*; originating in motives too obvious not to be underſtood, and too puſillanimous not to be reprobated. He goes on to ſay that if the publication in queſtion had been a fair hiſtorical narration of events, however replete with remarks, even approaching to licentiouſneſs, on public characters, if thoſe remarks were true, it would not have been proſecuted. This we muſt take leave to doubt; becauſe the eſſence of this libel, as deſcribed by Mr. Attorney General, is its tendency to defame and vilify the Chief Conſul of France, without any reference to the *falſhood* of the allegations, and he muſt know, that nothing could produce this effect

effect ſo fully as an hiſtorical narration of *facts*. Beſides, we are not to be told, that a libel is not leſs a libel for being *true*; and if the cabinet conceived it to be their duty in the one inſtance to proſecute, we know not on what principle they could refuſe to proſecute in the other. The diſtinction attempted to be laid down by Mr. Attorney, is a diſtinction which we ſhould in vain ſeek for in our law books, and which common ſenſe rejects; but his dictum is not law, and therefore it is needleſs minutely to diſcuſs his principles. We cannot ſufficiently expreſs our aſtoniſhment and indignation at hearing the caſe of the libeller of the unfortunate Queen of France, quoted in ſupport of a proſecution of one of her ſtaunchеſt defenders for attacking one of her moſt barbarous aſſaſſins. But this is not a queſtion of law, it is, as Mr. Pitt once ſaid in the Houſe, (we believe to Mr. Tierney, on the refuſal of his offers to head a troop of horſe in the Borough) a queſtion of *feeling*, which ſpeaks moſt forcibly to every man's boſom. We may pity, but we can never envy, the lawyer who could make ſuch a quotation on ſuch a trial. As to the deciſion on the caſe of Vint, for a libel on the Emperor of Ruſſia, if that be law, there is no more freedom of the preſs in this country, than in France. The libel of which the defendant in that caſe was convicted was ſimply this—"The Emperor of Ruſſia is rendering himſelf obnoxious to his ſubjects by various acts of tyranny, and ridiculous in the eyes of Europe by his inconſiſtency. He has lately paſſed an edict to prohibit the exportation of deals and other naval ſtores. In conſequence of this ill-judged law, an hundred ſail of veſſels are likely to return to this country without freight."—All this was plain matter of fact; and ſo true was it, that not long after, the ſaid Emperor became ſo obnoxious by his tyranny to his ſubjects, that they actually murdered him: Good heavens, who would be ſo mad as to diſcuſs, even in the way in which hiſtorical narration has ever been conducted, the politics of Europe, when, for ſuch a ſentence as this, he might be proſecuted by the Attorney General, and ſubjected, by the verdict of a jury, to a heavy fine, or a long impriſonment? Fortunately this man, like Mr. Peltier, was never brought up for judgment, but the deciſion remains on record, and ſtill ſerves as a precedent for ſimilar deciſions in future.

We, moſt aſſuredly, ſhould not tell Mr. Attorney that he was "an enemy to the liberty of the Engliſh preſs" for proſecuting "the *abuſe* of it," nor ſhould we have made a comment on his ſpeech, or on the proſecution itſelf, had the object of both been confined to the puniſhment of one who had inſtigated "to aſſaſſination." But thinking, as we do, that he went very much out of his road, to make unjuſt obſervations, and to lay down objectionable principles, which the ſubject did not call for, we ſhould ill diſcharge our duty, did we ſuffer either to paſs without cenſure. With all our abhorrence of aſſaſſination, however, we cannot agree with Mr. Attorney, that to exhort the French to deſtroy their tyrant, is the ſame thing, in time of *war* as in time of *peace*. "If it were in time of war, I ſhould have

no difficulty in ſtating, that there is ſomething ſo baſe, ſo diſgraceful; there is ſomething ſo contrary to every thing, that belongs to the character of an *Engliſhman*" (the defendant was a *Frenchman*, be it obſerved, *en paſſant*) " there is ſomething ſo immoral in the idea of aſſaſſination, that the exhortation to aſſaſſinate this, or any other chief magiſtrate, would be a crime againſt the honourable feelings of the Engliſh law." What *feelings* have to do with *law* we are yet to learn, and ſhould be very much indebted to Mr. Attorney, if he would condeſcend to inform us. We have already ſhewn that a queſtion of *law* and a queſtion of *feeling* are two very different things; and how it happens that *law* and *feeling* are juſt now to form an unnatural alliance for protecting the precious perſon of Napoleone Buonaparté, we profeſs not to know. There are certainly caſes in which we prefer *feeling* without *law* to *law* without *feeling*; but, a truce to equivoque—we beg pardon of our readers;—the ſubject is, indeed, too ſerious to be ſported with.

We concur with Mr. Attorney in his opinion, that if this publication were a libel on Buonaparté, it was of no conſequence, in the eye of the *law*, whether he held his ſituation by hereditary deſcent, or by recent uſurpation. But, here, with due deference to this law officer of *the Crown*, we muſt think his obſervation ought to have ſtopped; it had been carried far enough to anſwer his purpoſe. Gratuitouſly, therefore, to add what follows, was to betray an exceſs of zeal, not very commendable. " He (Buonaparté) is *de facto* chief magiſtrate, and is to be *reſpected* by thoſe, who are the ſubjects of that country, who owe a temporary allegiance to him. He is to be reſpected as if his anceſtors had enjoyed the ſame power for a number of generations!!!" If we had read this *tirade* in an anonymous publication, we ſhould have much ſooner imputed it to the Accuſateur public de la Republique Françaiſe, une et indiviſible, than to one of the firſt law officers of the Britiſh Crown. To volunteer ſuch an exhortation not merely to pay implicit obedience to, but even to *reſpect*, the government of a regicidal uſurper, and ſo to compliment uſurpation and injuſtice at the expence of legitimate right, was, we muſt ſay, unworthy a Britiſh Monarch's Attorney General.

We paſs over the evidence, as being both brief and immaterial, excepting as to one point. It ſeems to have been taken for granted, by the interpreter, by the counſel for the Crown, and by the Chief-Juſtice, that in wiſhing any man the honours of an *apotheoſis*, it neceſſarily follows that you wiſh him dead;—for that ſuch honours are only beſtowed on the dead. Now, they knew very little of the genius of the French language, or of the nature of the thing itſelf, who could draw ſo haſty and ſo unwarranted a concluſion. In the courſe of our reading we certainly have ſeen the word uſed in a very oppoſite ſenſe, and, indeed, we had actually marked a paſſage, in a book*

* Etrennes à M. de la Harpe.

which

which we reviewed in the Appendix to our 14th volume, (p. 459.) where it was applied to a new tragedy, by one of its ardent admirers, who, far from wiſhing it dead, muſt, of courſe, have deſired to prolong its life to the longeſt poſſible term of dramatic exiſtence. We have, unfortunately, miſlaid the book, but our readers, who are in poſſeſſion of it, will eaſily refer to the paſſage. If we are not miſtaken, too, *Le Divin Marat*, the quondam friend of Buonaparté, received the honours of apotheoſis, long before the impious hand of CHARLOTTE CORDAY deprived the virtuous patriot of life.

We now come to the ſpeech of Mr. Mackintoſh, certainly one of the moſt brilliant exhibitions of forenſic eloquence of which the Britiſh, or any other bar, can boaſt. It is not diſtinguiſhed merely for poſſeſſing all the conſtituents of true eloquence, but for the many juſt and wiſe remarks which it contains on ſubjects of great importance, diſplaying a copious fund of hiſtorical information, moſt perſpicuouſly arranged, and brought, moſt ably, to bear upon the immediate topic of diſcuſſion. We regret our utter inability, from the inſufficiency of our limits, to give even a brief analyſis of this admirable ſpeech. We muſt, from neceſſity, confine ourſelves to a very few quotations. Meeting the Attorney General's threat, with becoming firmneſs, Mr. M. ſpeaking of his client, ſays;

"He has a right to expect from me a faithful, a zealous, and a fearleſs defence; and this, his juſt expectation, according to the meaſure of my humble abilities, ſhall be fulfilled. I have ſaid, a fearleſs defence. Perhaps that word was unneceſſary in the place where I now ſtand. Intrepidity, in the diſcharge of profeſſional duty, is ſo common a quality at the Engliſh bar, that it has, thank God! long ceaſed to be a matter of boaſt or praiſe. If it had been otherwiſe, Gentlemen, if the bar could have been ſilenced or overawed by power, I may preſume to ſay, that an Engliſh jury would not this day have been met to adminiſter juſtice. Perhaps I need ſcarce ſay that my defence *ſhall* be fearleſs, in a place where fear never entered any heart but that of a criminal."

On the extreme delicacy of our anceſtors, in reſpect of political libels, and on the effect of a rigid execution of the laws, looſe, vague, and undefined as they are, on that ſubject, Mr. M.'s remarks are excellent.

"They know that the offence of a political libel is of a very peculiar nature, and differing in the moſt important particulars from all other crimes. In all other caſes, the moſt ſevere execution of law can only ſpread terror among the guilty, but in political libels it inſpires even the innocent with fear. This ſtriking peculiarity ariſes from the ſame circumſtances which make it impoſſible to define the limits of libel and innocent diſcuſſion—which makes it impoſſible for a man of the pureſt and moſt honourable mind, to be always perfectly certain, whether he be within the territory of fair argument and honeſt narrative, or whether he may not have unwittingly overſtepped the faint and varying line which bounds them.—But, Gentlemen, I will go farther. This is the only offence where ſevere and frequent puniſhments not only intimidate the innocent, but deter men

from the moſt meritorious acts, and from rendering the moſt important ſervices to their country—they indiſpoſe and diſqualify men for the diſcharge of the moſt ſacred duties which they owe to mankind. To inform the public on the conduct of thoſe who adminiſter public affairs, requires courage and conſcious ſecurity. It is always an invidious, and obnoxious office, but it is often the moſt neceſſary of all public duties. If it is not done boldly, it cannot be done effectually, and it is not from writers trembling under the uplifted ſcourge, that we are to hope for it."

This is ſtrictly true; but the danger is ſtill increaſed, while the motive for ſeverity is leſs potent, when the libel only reſpects a foreign government; and here again a diſtinction, in point of policy, muſt ever be made, between a government whoſe diſpoſition and conduct are friendly to this country, or who is in actual alliance with us, in time of war, and one whoſe diſpoſition and conduct are either notoriouſly hoſtile, or evidently about to become ſo.

"When vaſt projects of aggrandizement are manifeſted, when ſchemes of criminal ambition are carried into effect, the day of battle is faſt approaching for England. Her free government cannot engage in dangerous wars, without the hearty and affectionate ſupport of her people. A ſtate thus ſituated cannot, without the utmoſt peril, ſilence thoſe public diſcuſſions, which are to point the popular indignation againſt thoſe who muſt ſoon be enemies. In domeſtic diſcuſſions, it may ſometimes be the ſuppoſed intereſt of government to overawe the preſs. But it never can be even their apparent intereſt when the danger is purely foreign. A King of England who, in ſuch circumſtances, ſhould conſpire againſt the free preſs of this country, would undermine the foundations of his own throne; he would ſilence the trumpet which is to call his people round his ſtandard.

"Our anceſtors never thought it their policy to avert the reſentment of foreign tyrants, by enjoining Engliſh writers to contain and repreſs their juſt abhorrence of the criminal enterprizes of ambition. This great and gallant nation, which has fought in the front of every battle againſt the oppreſſors of Europe, has ſometimes inſpired fear, but, thank God, ſhe has never felt it. We know that they are our real, and muſt ſoon become our declared, foes. We know that there cannot be a cordial amity between the natural enemies and the independence of nations. We have never adopted the cowardly and ſhort-ſighted policy of ſilencing our preſs, of breaking the ſpirit and palſying the hearts of our people, for the ſake of a hollow and precarious truce. We have never been baſe enough to purchaſe a ſhort reſpite from hoſtilities, by ſacrificing the firſt means of defence; the means of rouſing the public ſpirit of the people, and directing it againſt the enemies of their country and of Europe."

Here follows an ingenious and ſpirited expoſition of the nature and effect of public ſpirit, which diſplays deep reflection, ſound judgment, and a truly philoſophic mind. With equal animation and wiſdom the orator next vindicates the rights of the hiſtorian, and alſo the general "right of expreſſing thoſe ſentiments which all good men feel on the contemplation of extraordinary examples of depravity or excellence." How the Attorney General *felt* when he heard this vindi-

vindication we know not; but we know full well, that all the emoluments of his office could not tempt *us* to experience ſuch *feelings* as *we* ſhould experience on ſuch an occaſion. The brief delineation of the prominent characteriſtics of the French revolution, and the deſcription of the preſent French factions, are moſt maſterly ſketches; but, indeed, where the whole is ſo excellent, it is almoſt unjuſt to point out particular paſſages. Our readers, however, cannot but be gratified, by the poetical tranſlation of the *Ode*, which excited ſo ſtrongly the ire of Mr. Attorney General, and which *we knew* was juſt as much written by Mr. Peltier as by ourſelves.

" Her glorious fabric England rears
On Law's fix'd baſe alone;
Law's guardian pow'r while each reveres,
England! thy people's freedom fears
No danger from the throne.

" For there, before all-mighty law,
High birth, high place, with pious awe,
In reverend homage bend.
There man's free ſpirit, unconſtrain'd
Exults, in man's beſt rights maintain'd,
Rights which, by ancient valour gain'd,
From age to age deſcend.

" Britons, by no baſe fear diſmay'd,
May power's worſt acts arraign.
Does tyrant force their rights invade?
They call on law's impartial aid,
Nor call that aid in vain.

" Hence, of her ſacred charter proud,
With ev'ry earthly good endow'd,
O'er ſubject ſeas unfurl'd,
Britannia waves her ſtandard wide,
Hence, ſees her freighted navies ride
Up wealthy Thames' majeſtic tide,
The wonder of the world."

We have heard this tranſlation aſcribed to one of the able writers of the "New Morality," which was publiſhed in the laſt paper of the Anti-Jacobin and Weekly Examiner. It is certainly a production worthy ſuch a writer. On the *apotheoſis*, Mr. M. truly obſerves;—

" Here my learned friend has a little forgotten himſelf;" (not a *little*) " he ſeems to argue as if *apotheoſis* always preſuppoſed death. But he muſt know, that *Auguſtus*, and even Tiberius and Nero, were deified during their lives, and he cannot have forgotten the terms in which one of the court poets of Auguſtus ſpeaks of his maſter's divinity—

——" Præſens divus habebitur
Auguſtus adjectis Britannis
Imperio."——

"If any modern rival of Auguſtus" (aye, or of *Nero* either) "ſhould chooſe that path to Olympus, I think he will find it more ſteep and rugged than that by which Pollux and Hercules climbed to the ethereal towers, and that he muſt be content with purpling his lips with Burgundy on earth, as he has very little chance of purpling them with nectar among the gods."

We lament, exceedingly, that our confined limits will not ſuffer us to tranſcribe the pages which contain a deſcription of the means by which Elizabeth was wont to rouze the ſpirit of her ſubjects; where every line glows with patriotiſm; and, in reading it, one can ſcarcely refrain from conſidering it as a ſatire upon *more modern* times.

"She ſpoke of their national honour, of their dignity as Engliſhmen, of '*the foul ſcorn that Parma or Spain* SHOULD DARE to invade the borders of her realms.' She breathed into them thoſe grand and powerful ſentiments which exalt vulgar men into heroes, which led them into the battle of their country armed with holy and irreſiſtible enthuſiaſm, which even cover with their ſhield all the ignoble intereſts that baſe calculation and cowardly ſelfiſhneſs tremble to hazard, but ſhrink from defending."

This is the ſpirit which is requiſite to overwhelm the raſh invaders of our iſle, and to hurl back their vengeance on themſelves; ſuch a ſpirit as the ſon of Chatham would not fail to breathe into modern Britons. Towards the concluſion of his ſpeech Mr. M. very pertinently, and forcibly, aſks the Attorney General, what he would have done, had we been at peace during the reign of Roberſpierre, and any public writer had written a true account of his atrocities, and thoſe of his aſſociates and agents, with ſuitable comments? Why, certainly, if the principles laid down on this trial be true, as there could be no doubt that ſuch publications would have *irritated the mind* of the Dictator, and have tended to *vilify* and *degrade* his government, and that the republican miniſter at this Court would have urged the proſecution, the Attorney General could not, if he had acted conſiſtently, have refuſed to proſecute. But, we exclaim with Mr. M.—"Better, ten thouſand times better, would it be that every preſs in the world were burnt, that the very uſe of letters were aboliſhed, that we were returned to the honeſt ignorance of the rudeſt times—than that the reſults of civilization ſhould be made ſubſervient to the purpoſes of barbariſm—than that literature ſhould be employed to teach a toleration for cruelty, to weaken moral hatred for guilt, to deprave and brutalize the human mind."

We have but one point to notice in the Attorney General's reply. Mr. Mackintoſh had ſaid, in the opening of his ſpeech, "the *real* proſecutor is the maſter of the greateſt empire the civilized world ever ſaw." In anſwer to this the Attorney General ſays; "I deny it. The proſecutor is the *chief magiſtrate* of the country in which we live." Now if the latter only meant to ſay, that the proſecution was brought in the King's name, it was no anſwer to the aſſertion of the former; beſides, the Jury wanted "no ghoſt to come from the grave" to give them that information. And if he meant to ſay, which one would

would naturally ſuppoſe, that the proſecution was not inſtituted at the deſire or inſtigation of Buonaparte. the official documents ſince publiſhed, very unfortunately, contradict him. Mr. Otto, in his Letter to Lord Hawkeſbury, of July 25th, 1802, tells his Lordſhip, that he had received an order to demand the puniſhment of Peltier, for a number of his paper, which he (Mr. Otto) had tranſmitted to Mr. Hammond ſome time before; and we know from a Letter of his Lordſhip's, that the matter was referred, in conſequence of ſuch repreſentation, to the Attorney General. Mr. Mackintoſh, therefore, was fully warranted in his ſtatement; Buonaparté *was* the *real* proſecutor, in the true and obvious meaning of the term; and the Attorney General's denial was, to ſay the leaſt of it, *incorrect*. We muſt here, by the bye, enter our proteſt againſt the application of the affected democratic title of *Chief Magiſtrate* to the SOVEREIGN of theſe realms. Before we quit this ſubject, we muſt obſerve, that after Peltier's trial, the Firſt Conſul made the editor of his *Official Gazette, the Moniteur*, ſay, "the proſecution was *not* required by France;" and "the Firſt Conſul was even ignorant of the exiſtence of Peltier's libels, till they came to his knowledge in the public accounts of the proceedings at this time." Great liars, it has been ſaid, ſhould have good memories; the Conſul, it ſeems, had forgotten the order which he had cauſed to be tranſmitted to his miniſter, Otto, ſome months before!!!

We are now about to tread upon tender ground; that is, to conſider the charge to the Jury here printed, as the charge of the firſt criminal Judge in this country, the Lord Chief Juſtice of the King's Bench. This charge contains one broad principle, alleged to be the Law of England on the ſubject of Political Libels, to the juſtice of which it is impoſſible for us to ſubſcribe. His Lordſhip is made to ſay, "*I lay it down as law, that any publication, which* TENDS *to degrade, revile, and defame perſons in conſiderable ſituations of power and dignity in foreign countries, may be taken to be and treated as a libel.*" Our readers will probably ſmile at this affected language, and very plainly perceive that if it is *law*, that a publication may be *taken to be and treated as* a libel, (which. by the bye, is very little removed from nonſenſe) it is, in law, a libel. We are not diſpoſed to treat the Lord Chief Juſtice ſo cavalierly as to ſay, with a worthy friend of ours, that "*Lord Ellenborough has forgotten what* LAW *was*;" but we will fairly meet the queſtion, and preſumptuous as we ſhall no doubt appear to many, confidently declare our opinion that, THIS IS NOT THE LAW OF ENGLAND. The *onus probandi* is, of courſe, impoſed on his Lordſhip, as being the perſon *qui allegat*, according to the common rule of evidence, *negationis autem nulla eſt probatio*. Now, the only proofs which his Lordſhip condeſcended to adduce in ſupport of his *ſweeping* propoſition, which ſtrikes at the very root of one of the beſt and deareſt privileges of free-born ſubjects, the right of free diſcuſſion, were the caſes quoted by the Attorney General, viz. Thoſe of Lord George Gordon for a libel on the Queen of

France,

France, and of Vint for a libel on the Emperor of Ruſſia. And, he expreſsly ſays, that it is from the deciſions in theſe caſes not having been judicially queſtioned, that he lays it down as law that ſuch publications, as thoſe which he deſcribes, are libels. We have not the reports of theſe caſes at hand, and they are not ſufficiently in our recollection, to enable us to ſtate on what points the deciſions in them turned. But it muſt certainly appear ſtrange, as theſe publications, if libels, are not rendered ſo by *ſtatute*, but by the *common law*, which is, as it were, coeval with the monarchy, that no proſecution ſhould ever have been inſtituted againſt them, till the latter end of the laſt century. This very plainly ſhews one of two things; either that the principle of the law of libels was never conſidered as extending to ſuch publications; or, if it was ſo conſidered, that it was ſo unjuſt and dangerous, that it ought never to be applied. We cannot, therefore, regard the two caſes adduced by his Lordſhip as ſufficient to counterbalance the ſilence of centuries on the ſubject, and to conſtitute, of themſelves, adequate proof of the exiſtence of the law, or the juſtice of its application. Beſides, we will aſk his Lordſhip, if ever there were a hiſtory publiſhed, which was not, if ever a hiſtory of the paſſing times can be publiſhed which will not be, a libel, within the comprehenſive ſcope of his principle? The moſt ſhallow-pated Attorney General that ever ſhewed his face in a Court of Juſtice might, with facility, make it appear, that any hiſtory has a *tendency* "to degrade, revile, and defame, perſons in conſiderable ſituations of power and dignity in foreign countries." We never yet read a hiſtory which had not ſuch a *tendency*, and, we dare ſay, nay we hope, we never ſhall, becauſe we are certain that a hiſtory ſo written as not to have ſuch a *tendency*, would not be written in the ſpirit of truth, and therefore could not anſwer the true purpoſe of all hiſtory—the information and inſtruction of mankind. Had this been deemed law, and acted upon as law, by our anceſtors, the fineſt ſpecimens of hiſtorical compoſition, of which any age or country can boaſt, had been loſt to the world. And if this be *now* to be received as law, the hiſtory of the French revolution can never be written, becauſe the mere narration of its hiſtorical facts will have a direct and immediate tendency "to degrade, revile, and defame perſons" (aye, *all* the perſons) "in conſiderable ſituations of power and dignity" in France; and thus the moſt awful, the moſt important, and the moſt inſtructive leſſons, ever offered to mankind, will be ſuffered to glide down the current of oblivion, without any benefit either to contemporaries, or to poſterity; while the moſt groſs and ſcandalous perverſion of facts will be recorded to miſlead the one and to deceive the other. In ſhort, no hiſtory of the preſent times can be publiſhed, without ſubjecting the author, publiſhers, and printers, to the penalties of a libel. This is no forced conſtruction, no ſtrained inference, but the inevitable conſequence of his Lordſhip's broad and comprehenſive principle,—a principle, from its latitude, moſt alarming; from its effect moſt dangerous.

His Lordſhip did not, like the Attorney General, make any exception in favour of hiſtorical compoſition, (and here, indeed, he preſerved a perfect conſiſtency), nor did he leave it to the Jury to ſay what was the *intention* of the author, but confined himſelf ſolely to the *tendency* of the publication. Can any principle, then, having the effect we deſcribe, to cruſh the ſpirit of hiſtory, to prevent the communication of the moſt important inſtruction, to ſtop the diſſemination of great, religious, political, and moral truths; and to check the expoſure of ſignal depravity and vice; can any principle, we ſay, having ſuch effect, be a principle of the law of England, which has been deſcribed as one of the moſt perfect ſyſtems of ethics which the wiſdom of man ever deviſed, and a principle, too, eluding the vigilance of our anceſtors, and, though exiſting for centuries, never called into action till within the laſt twenty years? It will not be contended, that there never before exiſted any powerful motive for bringing it into action, for it is too notorious to be denied, that ſwarms of publications, coming ſtrictly within the deſcription of Lord Ellenborough, appeared, in almoſt every part of the three laſt centuries. We conceive it a diſgrace to the preſent age, that this queſtion has not been fully diſcuſſed, by ſome of our lawyers, or by ſome other public writer, competent to the taſk. The preſs, to its ſhame be it ſpoken, indeed, has been ſilent, on one of the moſt formidable attacks that ever were levelled againſt it. Conſidering the ſubject, however, as involving topics of the greateſt importance to ſome of the deareſt intereſts of the country, we truſt it will ſtill experience a deep inveſtigation in a place where enquiry may be purſued with effect. A DECLARATORY LAW ſhould certainly be paſſed, that hiſtorians, and other public writers, may know what they have to truſt to, and no longer hold the right of free diſcuſſion, by the frail tenure of an Attorney General's caprice, or of a Chief Juſtice's dictum. We are fully aware of the impracticability of defining all caſes of libel; but ſuch libels as are the ſubject of theſe remarks, upon perſons of conſideration in *foreign* countries, may be eaſily defined, and, therefore, certainly ought to be defined.

At the concluſion of the charge Lord Ellenborough is made to ſay to the Jury: "Gentlemen, I truſt your verdict will ſtrengthen the relations by which the intereſts of this country are connected with thoſe of France." What this had to do either with the law or the juſtice of the caſe, to which, with all due ſubmiſſion, we think his Lordſhip's obſervations ſhould have been confined, it requires much more acute penetration than any we poſſeſs to diſcover. We forbear, from reſpect for his Lordſhip's *office*, to characterize the motive and *tendency* of this remark; but, when we couple it with the facts ſtated by Mr. Peltier, relative to the reported effect of the Jury's verdict upon the ſtocks, we cannot but *expreſs* our aſtoniſhment, and *feel* ſentiments of a ſtronger nature.

Having thus gone through the whole of this important trial, and exerciſed that freedom of remark, which the occaſion ſeemed to require,

quire, and which the independence of our minds will ever lead us to exercise, it only remains for us to express our conviction that the prosecution itself was most unwise and impolitic. It originated, we are persuaded, in that weak pusillanimous system of conciliation and concession which has, unhappily, marked nearly the whole of that disastrous period which has elapsed since the resignation of Mr. Pitt, and his colleagues; a system which, we know, has degraded us in the eyes of foreign powers, materially injured our interests, lowered our dignity, and impaired our consequence; a system in fine, a perseverance in which for a very few years, would infallibly bring this great empire to disgrace and ruin. As, however, the prosecution *was* instituted, and a verdict of *guilty* obtained; as the crime alleged, was affirmed to be great in time of *war* as well as in peace; as the case was argued, by the Crown, as a question not of *policy*, but of *principle*; and as principle does not vary with times and circumstances, we should be glad to know, on what plea the neglect to bring the defendant up for judgment can possibly be defended? Either, we contend, the prosecution ought not to have been brought, or judgment ought to have been pronounced. The renewal of hostilities could make no possible difference in the justice of the case. But the whole of their conduct who had the management of this prosecution is to be accounted for on no other principle than that to which we have referred it.

Mr Peltier's address to the public, which is subjoined to the trial, is spirited, and contains much curious and interesting matter, but our remarks have already been so copious, that we cannot extend them farther. We have only room to extract *one* of his interrogatories.

"How has it happened that I was found guilty for that on the 21st of February, when on the 8th of March following, it was proclaimed by the voice of government itself, in another hall, at Westminster, that my suspicions, my mistrust, my resentment were well-founded? In a word, that I should have been convicted as a disturber of peace which was not peace, friendship which was not friendship, and good understanding which was not good understanding, but '*a continued series of aggressions and insults on the part of the French government ever since the peace?*"

Let the ministers and crown lawyers answer, say we. But it is evident that any public-spirited Briton, who saw these constant insults and aggressions, and who, in consequence, had endeavoured to open the eyes of ministers, and of the country, to the conduct of the French, by shewing that they were nothing more than a repetition of those acts which the First Consul had invariably displayed to all other powers, would have been deemed a libeller, because he must have proved Napoleone Buonaparté to be utterly destitute of good faith, and of all political and moral honesty, which proof would certainly have had a direct *tendency* to degrade, revile, and defame, his precious

precious character. Yet it will not be denied that such a writer would have defended the cause of truth, and have acted the part of a genuine patriot!

## NOVELS.

*Very strange, but very true! or, the History of an old Man's young Wife. A Novel.* By Francis Lathom, Author of "Men and Manners,"—"Mystery,"—"Astonishment; or, a Romance of a Century ago,"—"Midnight Bell,"—"Castle of Ollado," &c. &c. &c. 4 vols. Longman and Rees. 1803.

IN novels, as in many other articles of literature, or of household furniture, there is a kind of a fashion: at one time all ghosts, and castles, and corridores; at another, monsters, that is, such personages as are to be no where found but in the maggoty brain of an author. On a third occasion, there is some likeness of human life. Of these likenesses there is great variety, both in object and execution, sometimes the likeness is exact, but the original is not worth the copying, like the performance of a Dutch painter, mentioned in Peregrine Pickle, who, pourtraying a beggar, very accurately represented a louse crawling on his shoulder. Sometimes the object is worthy enough of representation, but the execution completely fails, thus we find sketches of the beauties, graces, and virtues in heroes and heroines, which are the objects of laughter instead of respect and admiration. Thus in a novel which we once reviewed, the softness of the heroine, and the courage of the hero, are principally called forward by a vicious cow; the lady is first in danger from a ravisher, is thrown into a combustion, but is without much difficulty rescued by a most chivalrous lover, who happens to be much stronger than the ravisher; but Miss is thrown into a much greater quandary by the cow, who is more nearly a match for the valour of the lover. Mr. Lathom, it would appear from the title page, has tried both the marvellous and natural, the present is of the natural cast. We have a Miss Margaret Macdowal, who, though old, red haired, and squinting, had a great relish for handsome young men, tries to catch one, and he failing gets another, and that is the purpose of Miss Margaret Macdowal's appearance. Next is Mr. Clay, an attorney, as honest as can be expected, but afraid of ghosts, fond of a pretty girl, but still fonder of ham and roast chickens, such is the part he is to play. Next we have a parson, Dr. Leviathan, a votary of venison, of salmon, and of partridge pie, the consumption of which is the end that his reverence fulfils in the novel. Then there is Mrs. Macdowal, a very beautiful young woman, supposed to be of low rank, attracts the attention of a worthy old Countess, who, strange to narrate, proves to be the young lady's grandmother. Next we have Sir Luke Lowry, as great a wit as the author can make him, illustrated in an excellent good joke practised upon the parson, whom, to rebuke for his gormandizing, the facetious baronet treats with a hot meal dumpling, which so enraged the Doctor that he ate nothing at dinner but boiled beef. These are some of the characters; we have also specimens of manners, especially an oyster wench challenging some byestanders to try a bout with her at swearing. As another sample of the manners that appear to our autho. worthy of exhibition, is a card party, consisting of Mrs. Dapple,

Dapple, Mrs. Cheeſe, and Mr. Twinkum; in the deſcription of whom it is poſſible our author may be perfectly at home. Now and then, too, we have a touch at high life, or, more properly ſpeaking, at high names, for when we are introduced to Lady Catherine, we find that the language and ſentiments of her ladyſhip are nearly the ſame as of Mr. Twinkum and Mrs. Dapple. Two other characters are Meſſrs. Bownot, a Quaker, and Reuben, a Jew, they are introduced for the purpoſe of committing fraud, with the aſſiſtance of Mr. Clay, the attorney, and ſo they play their parts. Then there is a ſtrange eccentric character, Mr. Nathaniel Fennwin; the purpoſe of Mr. Fennwin's appearance is to ſteal dead corpſes, for making ſpermaceti candles, and prove father to the foundling, grand daughter to the Counteſs. The next figure is Major Connor O'Vannie, the buſineſs he is to perform is triple; firſt, to cuckold my Lord; ſecondly, to give his Lordſhip honourable ſatisfaction by killing him in a duel; and, thirdly, to run off with her Ladyſhip to France, all which he fully executes. Why theſe characters are grouped together we cannot undertake to determine.—What the plot is, if there be any, we have not found out. The cataſtrophe is five or ſix marriages, and ſo far happy; but Miſs Macdowal, the heroine's end, is tragical: ſhe dies of the rheumatiſm. All this may be *very true*, according to the title, but there is nothing *very ſtrange*. In all countries there will be clergymen and laymen alſo that prefer veniſon and wild fowl to meal dumplings; members of the law, as well as other members, who like pretty girls; young women who get married, and old who depart this life either by the rheumatiſm or ſome other diſtemper. We can ſee nothing which, according to the title, is very ſtrange. Mr. Latham's ideas of ſtrangeneſs are ſomewhat ſimilar to thoſe of Mr. John Lanne Bucchannan, who ſome years ago publiſhed a view of manners in the Hebrides, and mentioned a practice of lads and laſſes, who it ſeems in the Hebrides will ſometimes meet together in corners, and then it would appear the conſequences are often viſible ſome months after: ſuch phenomena the writer ranks among *ſingular cuſtoms*. But though we can neither diſcover much plot, nor force of character, in this production, there are a good many laughable incidents, and there is no want of broad farce, and a great variety of practical jokes. Readers who reliſh ſuch kind of paſtimes may paſs an idle hour worſe than in reading "Very Strange but Very True."

*Aſtoniſhment!!! A Romance of a Century ago.* By Francis Lathom, Author of "Men and Manners,"—"Myſtery Midnight Bell," &c. &c. 2 vol. Longman and Rees. 1802.

THOUGH earlier publiſhed than the laſt article, this work happened to have eſcaped our recollection until it was preſented to our mind in the title page of the other. This is one of the kind of works which the German ſchool firſt ſuggeſted, and the genius of Mrs. Ratcliffe rendered popular. We do not mean that it bears any reſemblance to the writings of that author, except in the ſcenery, which lies in France and Italy, in woods, caſtles, and monaſtries, and in the apparent myſtery, managed through the agency of friars, in humble imitation of Schedoni, and the Monk of Palluzzi, with imitations alſo of Mrs. Robinſon's Hubert de Severac, a diſtant follower of Mrs. Ratcliffe's exquiſite productions. The hero is Claudio, a foundling, who is patronized by the Marcheſe di Bartilona, and ſometimes viſited by a pilgrim. Becoming a man, he has the uſual aſſortment of graces

and

and accompliſhments, attracts the attention of a very beautiful lady, but conſiderably older than himſelf. To her apartments he is conducted by a prieſt with a large cowl, through heaven knows how many ſubterraneous paſſages, has frequent interviews, and is very near ſucceeding with the fair tempter, when, for ſome reaſon that he cannot ſolve, ſhe rejects, with abhorrence, advances which ſhe had before ſolicited. The apartments in which the lady reſided he finds to belong to the Inquiſition; there are, beſides, great numbers of chapels and monaſteries, with penitence and abſolution, and the various machinery of the Romiſh Church, with a quantum ſufficit of pageantry and proceſſions. In one of theſe Claudio again meets with the pilgrim, with whom he is extremely ſtruck, and on his diſappearance is very anxious to have an opportunity of again meeting with him. There is a great deal of myſtery about this pilgrim, and alſo a Benedictine friar, and a nun, with a conſiderable degree of perplexity, the intricacies of which a reader will find it difficult to unravel. Claudio meanwhile is wavering between two miſtreſſes, one of whom, Valeria, the ſiſter of his friend Lodovico, is in the houſe with him, and is a great favourite; the other, Zelia, is confined in a convent, but is a ſtill greater favourite. Claudio, and his friend Lodovico, undertake a journey over the Alps, there he meets the pilgrim in the form of a monk, and a very myſterious interview they have, ſomething upon the plan of the monk of Palluzzi. To atone, however, for the myſtery and ſerioufneſs, there is abundance of joking, of a ſimilar kind to that of Sir Luke Lowry's, in the former article. The travellers arrive at Paris, where Claudio is much troubled with an apparition, who writes letters upon the wall, and announces that he muſt never marry Valeria. His friend, the pilgrim, meets him in a new character, as the Chevalier de Gramont, and our hero is ſtill troubled with ſtrange warnings. From Paris they return to Italy, where Claudio finds his patron on the point of death. His patron bequeaths him his fortune, and alſo conjures him to marry Valeria. Sometime after the old Marcheſe's death, preparations are made for the wedding, but behold Claudio is ſurpriſed and carried away blindfold, dragged into a building which he finds to be a church, brought to the altar, and forcibly married; the ceremony being over, the bandage is removed, and he finds the bride to be Zelia. On the ſame day his friend Lodovico meets with an almoſt equally ſtrange accident. Soon after this Lodovico attempts the honour of a young lady, whom Claudio protects, a ſcuffle enſues, in which Lodovico falls, and Claudio is regarded as his murderer, and ſent to priſon; there he finds his myſterious acquaintance the pilgrim, who diſcovers himſelf to be his father, and is then in confinement for the ſuppoſed murder of Claudio's mother. Lodovico's father, the Count di Ponta, is, it ſeems, the father's greateſt enemy. The young lady reſcued by Claudio turns out to be his own ſiſter. The father, whoſe real name is Angelo, explains to Claudio the deceptions which he had practiſed on him in order to prevent his marriage with the daughter of the Count di Ponta. During the ſtill hour of the night Angelo ſuppoſes himſelf viſited by the ghoſt of his murdered wife; meanwhile the Count di Ponta comes into priſon and attempts to aſſaſſinate Angelo, and actually wounds him, but receives a dagger in his own breaſt from the hand of Horatia, the wife of Angelo, whom her huſband, in a fit of jealouſy, had wounded and left for dead. Immediately after the fall of Ponta ſhe ſtabbed herſelf, but left an account of her adventures. She proves to be the lady whom Claudio had ſeen in the ſubterraneous abode, and really his mother.

Valeria

Valeria turns out to be Claudio's half ſiſter. Claudio publicly acknowledges Zelia his wife; Lodovico is married to Claudio's ſiſter, Nina; Angelo recovers; and all parties in the uſual ſtyle are happy.

The *astonishment* is not a *misnomer*, for a reader is certainly aſtoniſhed at the myſterious and complicated means which are employed to bring about a very plain and ſimple purpoſe. When Claudio liked Zelia better than Valeria it was an eaſy matter to have him kept from marrying Valeria without the intervention of goblins. The eſſence, however, of the marvellous ſtyle of novel writing is *much ado about nothing*; the application of great variety of artifices and inſtruments for compaſſing an end in which there was not the ſmalleſt difficulty. In Mrs. Ratcliffe's marvels we find motives for moſt of the ſchemes and contrivances; but here there is myſtery for which there could be no motive but the love of myſtery itſelf. Of theſe kind of romances we have been obliged to ſkim over a conſiderable number; but, with the exception of Mrs. Ratcliffe's writings, recollect little of any particular works: how to rank Aſtoniſhment, therefore, among the *hobgobliana* we are ſomewhat at a loſs. The author is certainly very far from enchaining and tranſporting the fancy like the *Romance of the Forest*, the Arabian Nights' Entertainment, or any other fanciful creation of genius. Having always diſapproved of the ghoſt ſyſtem of tales, we are glad to find it is now got into ſuch hands. When ridiculous faſhions have reached the lower ranks it is a ſign they are going out from the higher.

* * *

*Reginal Di Torby, or the Twelve Robbers. A Romance.* 2 vols. 12mo. Lane. 1803.

OF the various publiſhers of printed books fitted for increaſing the quantity of nonſenſe, few, we believe, can boaſt of an equality with the proprietor of the Minerva Preſs; that ingenious perſon who has given the name of the goddeſs of wiſdom to the forge of folly. There are, however, great diverſities in that ſpecies of writing or diſcourſe to which we affix the denomination of nonſenſe; and ſeveral publiſhers of written balderdaſh patronize other ingredients as well as abſurdity. There were Mr. Daniel Eaton of the Cock and Swine, with other worthy brethren, for jacobinical nonſenſe. There were others whoſe fame reſted on libellous nonſenſe; while a third ſet vended blaſphemous, obſcene, or methodiſtical nonſenſe; and various venders aſcertained their reſpective characters by the kinds of their nonſenſe and their mixture with different commodities; and alſo reaped more ſolid recompences either in the pillory, Cold Bath Fields, Newgate, or ſome ſuch habitation appropriated to the diſſeminators of rebellious, indecent, or malignant nonſenſe. From theſe modifications the worthy publiſher before us, is, we believe, free. What iſſues from the Minerva Preſs, as far as we have had occaſion to obſerve, is pure and genuine nonſenſe. We find nothing directly hoſtile to our political eſtabliſhments; the chief object of hoſtility, indeed, is a great enemy to circulating libraries, and is known by the name of common ſenſe. In "Reginal di Torby" the great object ſeems to be to deviate as far as poſſible from probability. The hero is a thief; and he has an old caſtle with ſubterraneous abodes, where there is an old woman borrowed from Dame Leonarda in Gil Blas, and bloody apartments in imitation of Blue Beard. This thief runs off with woman after woman, gives them his keys with a ſimilar charge, and on ſimilar conditions with the celebrated hero of Mother Gooſe's

Goose's Tales. Strange noises are heard through the house, and particularly a voice calling out Death and murder!—The utterer of these horrid sounds proves to be an old grey parrot. One of the ladies gets off, and is the means of having the hero put to death. With the story of Reginal seven or eight more are intermixed. At the end our author, like many other novelists, informs us of the moral he intends. We confess the information is necessary, as we should not have discovered any moral lesson, or indeed immoral, as we can see no other purpose his labours possibly can serve, but filling twenty-four sheets of paper with certain printed characters, so composed as to wear the appearance of English words. Our author, however, has some degree of modesty; he dedicates his production to Oblivion, a personage which, it seems, has liberally bestowed his patronage on other works of the same author, and will, we doubt not, extend his protection to Reginal di Torby.

---

## POLITICS.

*The Grand Contest deliberately considered; or, a View of the Causes and probable Consequences of the threatened Invasion of Great Britain. With a Sketch of the Life and Actions of the First Consul; particularly since the Peace of* 1802. *Addressed to Britions.* By Francis Blagdon, Esq. *To which are subjoined Notes, historical and explanatory, and a British War Song, set to Music, for the Piano Forte, by the Author.* 8vo. Pp. 80. 1s. 6d. fine paper; or 12mo. 1s. common paper. Vernor and Hood.

THE very laudable intention of Mr. Blagdon has been, to exhibit, as it were at a single *coup d'œil*, the atrocities and insults of Buonaparté and the French government towards this country, ever since the signing of the memorable treaty of Amiens; the practicability of an invasion, and the probability of its very speedily taking place; and the dreadful consequences which must inevitably ensue, in the event of success on the part of the enemy. The chief actions—deeds of horror and of blood—of the Usurper's life are rapidly sketched, and Mr. Blagdon incessantly endeavours to infuse a proper spirit into his countrymen, the people of England.

Fortunately for Britain, the expulsion of aliens has, *at last*, taken place; we cannot, nevertheless, refrain from noticing a passage in the Postscript to this pamphlet, which is highly important, and deserving of the most serious attention. The author states it as being privately rumoured, "that on the night when the intelligence shall reach London, that the French have attempted to land, and particularly if it should have partially succeeded, the emissaries here are instructed TO SET FIRE TO THEIR APARTMENTS, IN VARIOUS PARTS OF THE METROPOLIS, and thus to produce a scene of horror and confusion similar to that which took place, by means of popish infamy, at the memorable fire of London."

Mr. Blagdon has been happy in his collection and condensation of facts; his pamphlet is well calculated to answer every end for which it is intended;

tended; and we cordially wish it the success and extensive circulation which it merits.

We had almost forgotten to mention the War Song, the words of which are taken from a former number of our Magazine.* We are not very scientific amateurs of music; but we have thrummed it over on our old piano, and we think the melody pretty, simple, easy, and consequently well adapted for the general run of voices.

*A Plan for the safe Removal of Inhabitants, not military, from Towns and Villages on the Coasts of Great Britain and Ireland, in the Case of the threatened Invasion: with Reflections, calculated to hasten Preparations for that Measure.* By J. Lettice, D. D. 8vo. Pp. 45. 1s. 6d. Clarke.

THE substance of this plan is, to call parochial meetings, for the purpose of ascertaining, and making into alphabetical lists, the names, with the numbers, of the respective families, and the numbers of those capable of walking, or to be carried, with the appointment of teams, &c. Every arrangement for removal is to be made; each individual is to be presented with a numbered ticket, bearing his name, stating the place of rendezvous, and the waggon or cart which he is to attend; and notices are to be affixed on the church doors, specifying the articles of sustenance, &c. to be taken for the accommodation of the fugitives. And his plan, the author informs us, has been adopted in the parish where he resides.

The pamphlet is well written, and we recommend the following passage to general attention:—

"Let it be repeated, gallant defenders of your country! that all who do not fall by your swords must be driven into the sea. For, as though the denunciation of a prophet, let it sink deep into every British bosom, and into the heart of every faithful son of Erin; that if, in the confidence of the first victory, mercy should incline you to spare, and to hold parley with a remnant before you, while dry land remained for their footing, with a foe who has sworn before landing to allow no quarter to faith and loyalty found in arms, it were eventually to give up your cause in the very face of conquest. They would mistake your mercy for failure of spirit; they would regard it as an omen of no distant success to themselves, and see no long interval between present parley and future capitulation. From this moment they would meditate new invasions, and return home but to send one blood thirsty legion after another, till, perhaps, all their hopes and wishes were crowned."

*The French Catechism: between an English Volunteer and a French Prisoner. From the British Neptune, Sunday, Aug.* 28, 1803. 12mo. Pp. 23. Price 2d. Ginger.

OF this cheap little pamphlet, it cannot be said, that it "keeps the word of promise to the ear, but breaks it to the hope:" the title page by no means does justice to the contents. To the Catechism, which is a very

* Vol. XIV. p. 111.

loyal,

loyal, judicious, and ſenſible effuſion, are jubjoined *The Biſhop of Llandaff's Thoughts on the French Invaſion*; *The Uſurper*; *The Iſland of Britain*, a Song; *May the King live for ever!* a Song, to the tune of *God Save the King*; and *Maſter Boney's Hearty Welcome to England: being the Song of Songs, and worth all the Songs in the World put together!* "The Uſurper," which is a very beautiful Ode, by a diſtinguiſhed literary character; and "The Iſland of Britain," as well as the Catechiſm, are from *The Britiſh Neptune*, a weekly news-paper, which we have before had occaſion to mention in terms of commendation.

*An Engliſh Taylor equal to Two French Grenadiers; or, Eternal Shame and Infamy on the daſtardly Coward, who would not ſhed the laſt Drop of his Blood in defence of his King and Country.* Second Edition. 12mo. Pp. 24. Price 2d. or 1s. 6d. per Dozen. Ginger.

THIS is a ſuppoſititious dialogue between a ſailor and a tailor turned ſoldier. It is replete with loyalty and patriotiſm, and is chiefly intended to impreſs an idea of the poſſibility of the French flotillas eluding the vigilance of our fleets, reaching our ſhores, and effecting a landing. This is highly proper, as the people, in general, evince too much ſecurity in the ſuppoſed impoſſibility of a deſcent.

*The Loyaliſt: containing Original and Select Papers, intended to rouze and animate the Britiſh Nation, during the preſent important Criſis; and to direct its united Energies againſt the perfidious Attempts of a malignant, cruel, and impious Foe. Addreſſed to all patriotic Perſons; eſpecially to the Soldiers, Sailors, and Loyal Volunteers, throughout England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland. Recommended for liberal diſtribution in every City, Town, Village, Camp, and Cottage of the United Kingdom.* 8vo. Nos. I. II. III. IV. V. VI. VII. Price 3d. each, or 2s. 6d. per Dozen. Hatchard.

THIS is a neatly printed periodical paper, partly original, partly compiled, containing ſome good articles, and, on the whole, very well adapted to the preſent moment.

*The Subſtance of the celebrated and patriotic Speech of the Right Hon. William Pitt, on Friday, July 22, 1803, on the General Defence Bill.* 8vo. Pp. 16. Price 3d. or 2s. per Dozen. Aſperne.

WE very much approve the practice of publiſhing, in a cheap form, the more valuable and patriotic ſpeeches of Members of Parliament. They carry more weight with them than ordinary publications, and, conſequently, the circulation of them ought to be promoted. There are many other ſpeeches, which we could point out, that might be diſtributed with much good effect.

*An Appeal to the Public Spirit of Great Britain.* By Charles Marsh, Esq. of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn. 8vo. Pr. 74. 3s. Cadell.

THIS certainly is not the most *forcible* "APPEAL" that was ever made; but, as every exertion, however feeble, if well directed, must be productive of some beneficial effect, its author merits respectable mention. The present crisis has been the means of producing an immense number of political tracts; and, if they are not all equally excellent, or equally beneficial to their literary parents, they must console themselves with the reflection, that "virtue is its own reward."

*Proceedings at a General Meeting of the Loyal North Britons, and the Speech of James Mackintosh, Esq.* 12mo. Pr. 44. Longman and Rees. 1803.

WHATEVER our opinion may be on the wisdom and vigour of ministerial measures, there can be no diversity of sentiment respecting the spirit of loyalty and patriotism which our present situation, however caused, has so strongly manifested. A considerable number of North Britons offered their services as a volunteer corps; and a meeting was advertised to be held at the Crown and Anchor, on Monday, August 8th, 1803: the advertisement stated that James Mackintosh, Esq. of Lincoln's Inn, was to be in the chair. About four hundred gentlemen assembled, and Mr. Mackintosh addressed them in a speech worthy of his high reputation for genius and eloquence. The original intention of the meeting was to consider the propriety of an address to his Majesty, expressing loyalty and inviolable attachment to him at the present awful crisis, which he forcibly described in a few words. "His Majesty's throne is now attacked, *because* it is the bulwark of the rights of his subjects, of the independence of all nations, and of all that remains of liberty in the world. Never was the king of a free people exposed to so honourable a danger. Never were freemen so imperiously called upon to rally round their prince." Doubts had arisen whether a military body should do an act which is, or ought to be, the result of deliberation. Mr. Mackintosh disapproved of men associated for a military purpose assuming a deliberative function. On this important subject the following were his words: "The British constitution, guided in this, as in most other cases, by the wisest principles of liberty, has interdicted armed bodies from deliberative acts, and our loyalty will not be the less zealous, or the less known, because we abstain from doing that which, in our military character is, perhaps, not quite reconcileable to the best principles of the laws of our country. We shall not fight her battles the worse for shewing reverence to her laws." On these grounds he thought the address should be postponed. In exhibiting the grounds of our apprehensions from France, Mr. Mackintosh accurately marks the extent and limits. "We have to do with an enemy who is not deterred by difficulties or dangers. He will not content himself with one sort of attack. He will not be driven from his purpose by the defeat of some attempt. Nothing will be left undone for the destruction of the only country that stands between universal tyranny. Against such a foe supineness would be destruction, but courage and energy is preservation. Let us not rely on the affiance of foreign powers. Is it to be endured, that this great and gallant nation, which has fought in the front of every battle for the liberties of Europe, and which, in spite of insolent boast, has often fought them single handed,

handed, ſhall be taught trembling to look for its ſafety by every return of a courier. It is not thus that a free, and proud, and mighty nation can be ſafe. Let us look to foreign ſtates, with a wiſh that they may be our friends, with no fear of their becoming our enemies, but with a determined reſolution to expect ſafety from ourſelves, and from ourſelves alone!" Unanimity Mr. Mackintoſh expects, with very few exceptions, becauſe he can conceive but very few inducements to treachery. "No man," he ſays, "can now ſecond the views of the enemy but a coward, or a mercenary, or a robber, or a parricide. A coward, who ſhrinks from perſonal danger—a mercenary, who is corrupted by the enemy—a robber, who deſires to ſhare the plunder of his honeſt fellow citizens; or a parricide, who is actuated by an unnatural and impious malignity againſt his country. I can conceive no other motive for treachery, except, indeed, that perverſion of underſtanding which borders upon inſanity." The enemy, however, he admits has ſome allies. "His allies are the murderers of Lord Kilwarden, who have ſelected an innocent, defenceleſs, pacific magiſtrate, not obnoxious even to themſelves, as their firſt victim, for no other conceivable purpoſe, but that of forewarning of the atrocious barbarity which we are to expect from them, and of apprizing that they deſpiſe every conſideration of private virtue, or of public ſtation, that ever ſtopped the dagger of the aſſaſſin." Twice before have the enemies of Britain and of Europe placed their hopes on a barbarous faction in Ireland. "Philip II. offered Ireland independence, which he knew ſhe could not enjoy, that he might reduce her under his yoke, and employ her as an inſtrument to enſlave England, and with her all civilized nations. Louis XIV. at the glorious æra of the revolution, held out the ſame lying offers of liberty to Ireland, that he might again enſlave both Ireland and England. Twice did our anceſtors reſcue the Iriſh people from the faction of theſe tyrants, and reſtore them to that ſpirit of Engliſh communion, which alone could repair the errors, miſfortunes, and miſgovernment of paſt times, which has made great advances in repairing them, and which, if it be ſuffered to proceed, will finally repair them all, as far as the infirmity of human legiſlation will allow." The ſpeaker proceeded to ſtate the obligations incurred by enrollment in a volunteer corps. In his peroration he mentioned the combined efforts of natives of the three united realms, and the unanimity that prevails among the upright in all the three to defend themſelves againſt a foreign tyrant and robber. "I know I ſpeak the ſentiment of every honeſt man, Engliſhman, Iriſhman, or Scotchman, when I ſay, that we will maintain inviolable that noble union which was conſolidated on the plains of Egypt and Syria, where every nation was repreſented by her hero; when Sir Ralph Abercrombie was ſeconded by Lord Hutchinſon, and aided by Sir Sidney Smith! Such a union we will ratify by our valour, and, if need be, ſeal with our blood!" He concluded in the following energetic words. "We, my countrymen, will rather ſeek freedom in the grave, than endure a degraded exiſtence, with the hideous ſpectacle before our eyes of a foreign tyranny erected in this ancient and choſen abode of liberty." This is a ſpeech highly meritorious in purpoſe, and maſterly in execution, and fully maintains the high character of its author. Mr. Mackintoſh, in political doctrines, is a very ſtriking inſtance of genius previous to the acquirement of experience deviating into erroneous theory, but, after maturity of reflection, abandoning viſionary ſpeculation for ſolid wiſdom.

# DIVINITY.

*A Sermon preached at St. Andrew's Church, Plymouth, at the Visitation of* the Venerable *Ralph Barnes, M. A. Archdeacon of Totness, May* 27, 1803, by J. Bidlake, B. A. Chaplain to his Royal Highneſs the Duke of Clarence, and Maſter of the Grammar School. 8vo. Pp. 29. 1s. Haydon, Plymouth; Murray, London.

THIS diſcourſe from the 12th ver. 1ſt chap. of 2d Epiſtle of St. Peter, "*I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance of these things, though ye know them and be established in the present truth,*" is replete with judicious remark, and good counſel to the clergy. The following obſervation, we conceive, will in ſome degree apply to the evangelical *teachers* within the pale of the church, who expound but apply not, who are ſo continually employed in laying the foundation, but never think of raiſing any ſuperſtructure; by whom Chriſtian morality is conſidered as totally irrelevant to the doctrine of the Goſpel, and who do all they can to controvert the purpoſe of our bleſſed Lord's example, by inceſſantly inſiſting upon doctrinal principles to the total excluſion of his preceptive law.

"In order to prepare ourſelves for the reception of religious truth, we ſhould firſt endeavour to impreſs our minds with enlarged ideas of the Deity himſelf; for this is the foundation of all ſubſequent opinion. Narrow conceptions of the divine attributes, produce narrow deductions, and diſqualify us from comprehending any enlarged ideas of his diſpenſation. As the eye by long continuance in darkneſs, from a contraction of the pupil, becomes incapable of ſuſtaining a ſtrong light, ſo the mental faculties may be diſqualified from bearing a ſufficient degree of illumination. Again, by accuſtoming ourſelves to look only at the parts of a ſubject, like inſects, whoſe viſual organs are ſmall, we ſhall become incapable of comprehending the whole proſpect before us. From ſuch narrow apprehenſions ariſe the abſurdities of enthuſiaſm. The firſt principles of religion being contracted, ſubſequent views are narrow and partial. To this muſt be attributed the ſtrange infatuation which ſeduces even men of education, to the miſerable delusions of fanaticiſm. Blinded by heated imagination, they convert religion into a mere rhapſody of words; and inſtead of enlightening and expanding the minds of their hearers, deepen the twilight of ignorance, and overwhelm it with total darkneſs. This is the more to be lamented, becauſe religious enthuſiaſm is more generally prevalent in the preſent day, than is reconcileable with the general increaſe of knowledge. If this fervent zeal were employed to excite the ſluggiſhneſs of indifference, or to awaken the ſinner from the ſleep of infatuated guilt, it might not only be innocent but even uſeful. Unhappily, however, fanatical opinions are injurious to the important intereſts of morality; morality the only true teſt of religion, the demonſtrative life of faith; the fruit by which the value of the tree can alone be eſtimated; morality the body, by which alone the ſpiritual exiſtence is evident; the living exemplification of the divine attributes; the perfection of man, and the intellectual creation of God."

Piety

*Piety and Courage; a Sermon preached in Portland Chapel, on Sunday Morning, July* 17, 1803, by the Rev. John Crofts, A. M. Miniſter of Portland Chapel. 12mo. Pp. 22. 3d. or 2s. 6d. per dozen. Hatchard.

THIS diſcourſe, the conſiderable merit of which has carried it through two editions, holds a pre-eminent rank among the patriotic efforts of our church at this eventful period. From Hezekiah's prayer, in the 19th chap. of the 2d Book of Kings, our reverend author has drawn a ſtriking parallel between the impious daring of the tyrant Sennacherib and the no leſs blaſphemous preſumption of the blood-ſtained Corſican;—and thus he applies it.

"Of that reſiſtleſs and overwhelming flood, which like a deluge has poured along, this our country, and this alone, has effectually ſtemmed the torrent. Of that artful and ambitious enemy, which, like the Aſſyrian, has aſſailed the nations, the deſpiſer of public faith, the diſturber of ſocial order, the deſtroyer of mankind, and the defier of God, this our country, and this alone, ſucceſsfully has checked the ſanguinary ambition. We have ſtood ſingle in the gap—we have beheld the confederate powers, that oppoſed his deſolating progreſs, ſhrink from the conflict, diſmayed and overcome—we have beheld them, like Hamath and Arpad, and the nations, that fell before Sennacherib, receive the *yoke of the conqueror*; and having begun by fighting under our banners, before the cloſe of the conteſt they have been compelled to arm againſt us. Still we have oppoſed, and, by God's bleſſing, with ſucceſs,

"Againſt us, therefore, its envied and ancient rival, but now much its foe, have all the weapons of revolutionized France been inſatiably employed. It has attempted, by ſecret influence to undermine, by open violence to deſtroy, the proud foundations of our nation's glory—to wreſt from us our religion, our laws, our independence; to taint our boſoms with the deadly poiſon of its infectious principles; to erect the ſtandard of infidelity and rebellion; and, having debaſed the mind to the loweſt and moſt licentious turpitude, to acquire over the body an eaſy and reſiſtleſs triumph! Such have long been its inveterate aims; and they have been purſued by every means, which the moſt ingenious and ſubtle malice could ſuggeſt—hitherto baffled in theſe hoſtile efforts, it now prepares to ſtrike a laſt, but deadly, blow—to furround with an invading hoſt our choſen Iſrael—to pour its rapacious multitudes upon our coaſt—to make this land of Canaan the ſcene of blood and deſolation—to give our property to lawleſs rapine; and to devote our lives to the ſword.

"After the full experience we have already enjoyed of the divine mercy, the alarm, which ſuch threats ſound in our ears, ſhould rouze, but not intimidate—ſhould excite, not terror, but exertion!—We muſt feel that, not a ſtruggle for power; not the ardour of conqueſt; not the proſpect of an empty triumph; but the exiſtence of our beſt, our deareſt, our moſt invaluable rights, is now the prize of contention, and calls us to the field! This conviction will infuſe new energy into our ſouls; a deep ſenſe of the ineſtimable importance of thoſe bleſſings we have at ſtake muſt animate the free and independent ſpirit of an inſulted and indignant nation, to its higheſt pitch. We have ſeen that the Providence of God has been eminently diſplayed in the protection of thoſe, who have a deep ſenſe of his goodneſs—a juſt value for their own bleſſings—and evince an undaunted courage in their defence.—For this divine aid we now devoutly pray; not

expecting the Almighty to make bare his arm by a miraculous interpoſition, or ſend an angel to deſtroy our enemies; but in the fervent hope, that he will inſpire us, with one heart, and one conſent, to contend in a juſt and righteous cauſe with energy and zeal; and thus enable us to triumph over the power and malice of our enemies."

The preacher then concludes with the following animating addreſs, extracted from the 1ſt and 2d chapters of the 1ſt book of Maccabees.

"Wherefore, my brethren, be ye ſtrong in the Lord, and of good courage.

"Fear not the words of a ſinful man; for his glory ſhall be as worms—to-day he is lifted up, and to-morrow he ſhall not be found; becauſe he will be returned to his duſt, and his thoughts come to nothing—for the victory of battle ſtandeth not in the multitude of an hoſt, but ſtrength cometh from Heaven. They come againſt us in much pride and iniquity, to deſtroy us and our wives, and our children, and to ſpoil us—we fight for our lives and for our laws—now then be ye very zealous for this cauſe and for the covenant of our fathers—call to remembrance their noble acts; and ſhew yourſelves to be their ſons—arm yourſelves! be valiant and in readineſs! that ye may fight with these enemies, that are aſſembled together againſt us, to deſtroy us and our ſanctuary—then ſhall ye obtain ſafety and deliverance—glory and honour among the nations of the earth—and an everlaſting name, that ſhall not be cut off."

*Obedience to Government, Reverence to the Conſtitution, and Reſiſtance to Bonaparté: a Sermon preached at Bury St. Edmund's, before the Right Hon. Lord Chief Baron Macdonald, and the Hon. Mr. Baron Hotham, at the Aſſizes, held there July 29, 1803*; by the Rev. Charles Edw. Stewart, A. M. Chaplain to the Sheriff. 4to. Pp. 16. 1s. 6d. Gedge, Bury St. Edmund's; Bickerſtaff, London.

FROM that very appropriate text in the 3d chapter of the Epiſtle to Titus—*Put them in mind to be ſubject to principalities and powers, to obey magiſtrates, to be ready to every good work*, Mr. Stewart has produced a valuable diſcourſe, embracing the three chief topics which claim the attention of Engliſhmen at the preſent hour. He has argued the fundamental principle of his ſermon "that obedience to government is a Chriſtian doctrine," with much ingenuity.

"You are ſenſible that ſubmiſſion is laid down in the moſt expreſs and abſolute terms; that Chriſtianity, upon its firſt eſtabliſhment, being miſrepreſented to the ſeveral powers then ſubſiſting, or miſunderſtood by ſome of its proſelytes, there was occaſion to urge the neceſſity of obedience, as an apology to the former, and a direction to the latter. The chief controverſies therefore drawn from Scripture concerning Government, have related not ſo much to the object, as to the extent of obedience; ſome few enthuſiaſts only, or ſome very corrupt profeſſors, having endeavoured to build a church upon the ruins of the ſtate, and to eſtabliſh the kingdom of Chriſt by deſtroying the ſeveral empires in the world. The meaſures of ſubmiſſion, as they have been agitated by many writers, have been clearly illuſtrated, and they who have conſidered the matter moſt impartially have ſhewn, beyond contradiction, that Chriſtianity leaves Government as it found it; that all the commands in the New Teſtament preſs nothing more than the general doctrine of a quiet and peaceable ſubmiſſion to the pow-

ers

ers eſtabliſhed, upon whatever foundation they ſtand. Chriſtianity conſiders mankind in a religious capacity only: it enjoins us to be ſubject to every ordinance of man, that is to every command of governors, acting within the limits of their authority, conſiſtent with our duty to God, who, for his own wiſe purpoſes, does by the providential courſe of things, vary the reſpective forms of Government, and divert the ſtreams of power into different channels. The obedience of a man, conſidered as a member of ſociety, is determined by the appointment of the legiſlative power in that ſociety to which he belongs, and the authority of laws duly promulged; and reaches no farther than the external behaviour: That of a Chriſtian, conſidered as ſuch, extends to the ſprings of action, is reſolved into the obligations of conſcience, directed by the will of God, the only ſupreme and abſolute governor of all mankind. Whatever conduces to the general good of mankind is the ſubject of ſocial virtue, and the command 'that we love our neighbour as ourſelves, and that we do to others as we would they ſhould do unto us,' makes it our duty to promote it. That our own happineſs is concerned, and the public welfare a benefit to the individual, is owing to the goodneſs of our indulgent lawgiver, who has been pleaſed to eſtabliſh an happy connection between duty and intereſt, and is not ſo properly the reaſon for compliance, as a motive to it: for whatever natural advantages God hath annexed to the performance of moral actions; how conſonant ſoever they may appear to the reaſons and relations of things, they are no otherwiſe moral than as they have a reference to the will of him who has conſtituted thoſe relations, who by right of creation has authority to enjoin what laws he thinks proper, and by his unlimited power is able to enforce obedience to whatever he commands. The reaſons and relations of things may be a medium by which we arrive at the knowledge of our duty, and a ſubordinate inducement to it, but obligation muſt reſt upon the will of a ſuperior. Were it not ſo, our engagements to act would be different according to the capacities of men to judge, and we ſhould be more or leſs religious, in proportion, not to the rectitude of the will, but to the meaſure of the underſtanding. No action, ſimply conſidered, is good or bad; it is the intention which determines the morality or obliquity of it. Our inclination therefore is the true meaſure of our obedience, becauſe this is founded in the will, and a principle of religion in the heart conſecrates every action into a religious ſervice. But as the principle is what determines the nature of our actions, and the perfection of our duty, it is equally neceſſary that we manifeſt that principle by our behaviour. If then it is the buſineſs of miniſters to inculcate the fundamental obligations of religion, when they have eſtabliſhed the great law of piety to God, and obedience to his commands in whatever particulars he has directed this diſpoſition to be exerted, it will be proper for them in His name, and by His authority, to require the performance. We can fix a principle of virtue in the heart upon no other foundation than the will of God. But with regard to particular injunctions, wherever he hath been pleaſed to explain the immediate advantages, or we are capable of diſcerning them, and we can add the inducement of preſent intereſt; we are at liberty not only to command, but to perſuade, to urge as well the motives of intereſt, as the obligations of duty."

Mr. Stewart will pardon us if we make one extract more.

"If the argument drawn from the nature and ends of Government be ſufficient to engage a dutiful compliance with authority upon religious prin-

principles, how much more ſtrongly will it conclude in our own caſe, and recommend a ready obedience, if we are ſo happy as to live under that particular form which is beſt calculated to ſecure the general purpoſe.—That ſuch is our ſituation will appear from a ſhort conſideration of our religious and civil eſtabliſhment. Our religion is true and genuine Chriſtianity, reformed from the groſs errors of Popery, and free from the wild frenzy of enthuſiaſm. Diſclaiming all coercive methods, our church allows to others the liberty which ſhe has vindicated to herſelf, and treats with lenity and forbearance thoſe who think themſelves obliged to diſſent from her; her public ſervice is neither deſtitute of grace and dignity, nor yet laboriouſly nor fancifully ceremonious; neither ſupinely negligent, nor vainly oſtentatious; her doctrines are authoriſed by the ſcriptures; her precepts are calculated to procure and to perpetuate the peace and happineſs of mankind. Next to this ineſtimable bleſſing is that of our Laws and Government. The mixed form of our Government gives conſtitutional vigour to the whole; in a great meaſure ſecures to us the peculiar advantages and exempts us from the inconveniences of other forms. Laws to which we give our conſent—trials by our equals—independent judges, that ſingular guard and fence of liberty, which prevents the detaining men's perſons on ſtate pretences, and can only be ſuſpended by an act of the legiſlature, when they think it requiſite for the public ſafety; a liberty of ſpeaking and writing, accountable not to a foreign deſpot, but only to the laws; are amongſt our envied privileges, and contribute to form a conſtitution, than which a better could not have been contrived, to keep within due bounds the power of the Prince on one hand, and the liberty of the people on the other.

" If we look backward and compare our preſent ſituation with that of our forefathers at any former time: if we look around us and compare our own condition in this reſpect with any of the neighbouring nations; even with free and regenerated France, where, we are told, has been eſtabliſhed '*the moſt ſtupendous and glorious edifice of liberty ever erected upon the foundation of human integrity in any time or country:*' if, I ſay, we compare ourſelves with that '*Great Nation,*' we ſhall ſee abundant reaſon to rejoice in our lot, and to magnify the goodneſs of God towards us."

Its intrinſic merit ſufficiently recommends this ſenſible, ingenious and ſeaſonable diſcourſe to the attention of our readers; but after bearing our teſtimony to that, we ſhould not eaſily forgive ourſelves were we to omit informing them that the profits ariſing from its ſale are intended to be given to the boats' crews of the Naiad frigate, Capt. Wallis, who, under the command of Mr. Deane, firſt lieutenant,—Mr. Louis, third lieutenant,—Lieut. Irwin of the marines, Meſſrs. Gordon, Glenny, and Edward Stewart, *(ſon of the author)*, all volunteers, brought off a French national ſchooner, La Providence, lying in the Straits in the bay of Breſt, on the 5th of July, 1803. We congratulate the reverend author on the ſhare which his ſon had in this noble deed. May the ſhield and buckler of Heaven preſerve in the mortal hour of conteſt a youth of ſuch gallant promiſe, and long may it be ere the laurels of the child wither on the parent's tomb!

*A Sermon preached before the Philanthropic Society, on Thursday, April* 28, 1803. By Thomas Biddulph, A. M. Miniſter of St. James's, Briſtol, and of Bengworth, in Worceſterſhire; and Chaplain to the Right Hon. the Dowager Lady Bagot. 8vo. Pp. 28. 1s. Rofe, Briſtol.

THIS is a truly pious and a pathetic diſcourſe, preached in the cauſe of a moſt beneficial inſtitution, eſtabliſhed at Briſtol, for the purpoſe of ſecuring proviſion for the widows and orphans of the ſubſcribers to a fund raiſed upon ſimilar principles to thoſe of the Pelican Office, in London.—The following paſſage will afford our readers ſufficient proof of both the piety and pathos of this well-written ſermon.

" There is a tribute of approbation due to the Philanthropic Society on another ground, which muſt not be paſſed over with neglect. I mean the religious appearance given to its inſtitution by the preſent attendance of its members in the houſe of God. Every act of a rational mind ſhould be connected with religion; and more eſpecially ſhould every important ſtep that we take in life, be preceded by an acknowledgment of God as our Creator, our Preſerver, and Redeemer; and be conſecrated by prayer and praiſe. 'Whatever we do, all is to be done in the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, giving thanks to God and the Father by Him.' 'In all our ways we are to acknowledge Him, that he may direct our paths.' You have done well therefore, my brethren, in laying yourſelves and your inſtitution before the footſtool of the throne of grace. On the bleſſing of God depends the ſucceſs of whatever we undertake. 'In Him we live, and move, and have our being.' He muſt 'prevent us in all our doings by His moſt gracious favour, and further us by His continual help;' or otherwiſe we can bring no ſcheme in which we embark, to an happy termination. To walk in a ſtate of friendſhip with Him and of obedience to Him, after the example of Enoch, is both our high privilege and our bounden duty. Let every future ſtep, then, which you take, whether as a ſociety or as individuals, whether unitedly or ſeparately, correſpond with this preliminary ſtep. Remember that, by your perſonal appearance this day in the courts of the Lord's houſe, you have profeſſed your entire dependance on Him and devotedneſs to Him. And Oh, remember the certainty and near approach of that awful event, death, on the expectation of which your ſociety is founded. By enrolling your names in the catalogue of ſubſcribers to the Philanthropic Fund, you explicitly avow, in language more energetic than that of words,—'*I am a dying man, and I know not the day of my death.*' Any inſtance therefore of levity, any tendency to irreligion, would be incompatible with the object of your ſociety, hoſtile to its deſign, and detrimental to its intereſt. Its object is a preparation for death. As a motto you may properly ſelect and adopt the ſolemn declaration of St. Paul, '*It is appointed unto men once to die.*' And as 'Godlineſs,' i. e. an univerſal regard to God in all our thoughts, words, and actions, 'hath the promiſe of the life that now is, as well as of that which is to come;' ungodlineſs, i. e. a forgetfulneſs or neglect of God, muſt be prejudicial to your temporal as well as to your ſpiritual intereſts. O! let nothing be ſuffered among you that is incongruous with theſe convictions; nothing that will give you pain in a dying hour; nothing inconſiſtent with thoſe ſenſibilities, which ought to be predominant in the boſom of a dying man. Let hilarity without levity, friendlineſs without profaneneſs, pleaſure without exceſs, and ſeriouſneſs without moroſeneſs, reign in your ſocial

cial meetings! Genuine piety is chearful, but not inconſiderate; and while it baniſhes ſlaviſh dread from the mind, it produces and cheriſhes ſuch a ſenſe of the Divine preſence as is altogether inconſiſtent with the ebullitions of carnal gaiety. For 'them that honour me I will honour,' ſaith the Lord of hoſts; 'and they that deſpiſe me ſhall be lightly eſteemed."

The truly paſtoral concluſion of this Diſcourſe completes its excellence.

"I ſhall not deviate from my proper ſphere of action, as a miniſter of religion, if I take the preſent opportunity of reminding thoſe who are laudably engaged in providing for the future welfare of their families, that their children have other claims on them, of which the Philanthropic Society can take no cognizance. They have ſouls, as well as bodies, to be cared for: and, as the former are infinitely more valuable than the latter, they call for more ſolicitude and greater exertions in the promotion of their welfare. The child, whom an indolent, extravagant, or vicious parent has left pennyleſs in a dreary world, may juſtly reflect with ſeverity on the want of natural affection in him from whom he derived exiſtence. But what bitter execrations may not reprobate children, in a ſtate of future miſery, accumulate on the head of an ungodly parent, who neglected to bring them up 'in the nurture and admonition of the Lord,' to inſtruct them in the way of ſalvation, and, by precept and example, by exhortation and reſtraint, to farther their eternal peace? The thought is too horrible to be prolonged!!! And, for the prevention of ſo great an evil, let us uſe all diligence in conducting thoſe who are committed to our care, in that narrow path which leadeth to life everlaſting.

"I muſt, moreover, my brethren, be permitted to add that, if *his* guilt who 'provideth not for his own, and ſpecially for thoſe of his own houſe,' be confeſſedly great; if *his* criminality ſurpaſs that of an 'infidel' or heathen; the man who neglects to make any proviſion for the welfare of his own ſoul, by ſlighting the great ſalvation of the Goſpel, muſt be chargeable with tenfold guilt. For our ſouls may be called *ours* in a ſenſe more emphatic than any other poſſeſſion. The ſoul is the principal part of man; and 'What is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and loſe his own ſoul? or what ſhall a man give in exchange for his ſoul?' If a concern for our wives and children be peremptorily required by the importunate voice of natural affection; how much more a concern for our own ſouls! If the book of revelation criminates him who is deſtitute of a regard for thoſe whom God has committed to his care; how much more frequently and ſolemnly does it exhibit the folly and ſinfulneſs of him, who leaves his own eternal intereſts to a peradventure, or rather to a certainty of ruin! To live without repentance and faith in Chriſt, is to inſure eternal perdition; for through Him only can we be ſaved, and the penitent only will derive ſalvation from Him. We are indiſputably chargeable with guilt, and obnoxious to puniſhment. Have we provided for the abſolution of the one, and an eſcape from the other, by a recourſe to the atoning ſacrifice of the great Redeemer? Have we 'fled for refuge to the hope which the Goſpel ſets before us?' Are we inwardly prepared for a participation of 'the inheritance of the ſaints in light,' by a cultivation of that 'holineſs, without which no man ſhall ſee the Lord?' Is our life on earth 'a life of faith in the Son of God,' and of devotedneſs to His ſervice? By your preſent appearance in this place of worſhip, you acknowledge your expoſure to the ſhaft of death; and that perhaps at an unexpected hour. You openly avow

yourſelves

yourſelves dying men. Let me, therefore, exhort you in the words of the Prophet, 'Prepare to meet thy God.' O ſecure to yourſelves an intereſt in the meritorious interceſſion of the Lamb of God, and in the ſanctifying influence of the Holy Ghoſt. Then you may adopt the words of Simeon, and joyfully ſay, having provided for the eternal ſalvation of your own ſouls, and for the temporal maintenance of your reſpective families; 'Lord, now letteſt thou thy ſervant depart in peace according to thy word, for mine eyes have ſeen thy ſalvation."

We have been much gratified with reading this plain, and highly uſeful Diſcourſe. Its beneficial tendency extends beyond the particular object of its application. There is ſo much ſpiritual admonition and juſt remark contained in it, that it is well calculated to edify all conditions of men under all circumſtances of their earthly ſtate.

*Zeal and Unanimity in the Defence of our Country, recommended in a Sermon preached in the Parish Church of Great Baddow, Eſſex, on Sunday, July 24, 1803, and published at the Request of the Parishioners.* By A. Longmore, LL. B. Vicar. 8vo. Pp. 30. 1s. Meggy and Chalk, and R. C. Stanes, Chelmsford; Keymer, Colcheſter; Burkitt, Sudbury; and Rivingtons, London. 1803.

IT is no trifling proof of that zeal and unanimity which the author of this diſcourſe has ſo forcibly recommended, that all theſe politico-theological efforts of the pulpit, which have come before our view, have been publiſhed by the requeſt of the reſpective congregations to whom they have been preached. Such efforts are at this time peculiarly requiſite and efficacious; and, as churchmen, attached with all our hearts and ſouls to the eſtabliſhment, both in church and ſtate, we feel the greateſt gratification at witneſſing the piety and patriotiſm which the Britiſh pulpit, at this momentous criſis, diſplays. The faithful Chriſtian paſtor and ſubject are alike manifeſted in the eloquent, ſpirited, and ſpiritual effuſions which have been recently delivered by our national prieſthood. And, in no one of theſe does there exiſt ſtronger proof of this than in the preſent article, which thoſe who heard it delivered ſeem thoroughly convinced of, as the following letter, addreſſed by the pariſhioners to the writer, abundantly teſtify.

"Sir, *Great Baddow Veſtry Room, 29th July,* 1803.

"In times ſuch as the preſent, an eventful criſis, when we are called on to defend, and it is our duty to fight for our king, our liberties, our country, and every thing that can, or ought to be dear to a free people, and a great and independent nation—We, your pariſhioners, in Veſtry aſſembled, beg leave to take this opportunity of offering you our moſt grateful acknowledgments, for your moſt excellent diſcourſe, ſo forcibly and ſo impreſſively delivered in our pariſh church, on Sunday laſt, the 24th inſtant.

"The plain and ſound morality, the loyalty and patriotiſm, as well as the truly Chriſtian duties of brotherly love which we owe to each other, ſo ſtrongly and feelingly enforced, by example united with precept, have had, we truſt and hope, their due effect on all and each of us.

"We are aware, from our knowledge of you, of your unwillingneſs to commit to print what was drawn up and intended to direct our loyalty, and to inſtruct us in our public and private duties. We are anxious and earneſt, however, to have, as a record in our families, your exhortation to us, as delivered by you on Sunday laſt.—We therefore earneſtly requeſt you will

will allow it to be printed, to enable us to have a reference to what we have so sensibly felt, when instructing our children in the duties which they owe to their king and their country, that, following the example of their fathers, they may, when grown up to manhood, adopt their firm and solemn determination to find their grave on the last foot of their native soil, rather than be the dupes of Gallic perfidy, or the reluctant slaves of Corsican despotism."

"*To the Rev.* ALEXANDER LONGMORE,
*Vicar of Great Baddow, Essex.*"

To so strong a testimony, so just to their pastor, so creditable to themselves, we have only to add, that in every point of view the Discourse is deserving of it.

---

*The National Defence: a Sermon, preached in the Parish Churches of Wainfleet, All Saints, and Thorpe; in the County of Lincoln, on Sunday the 7th of August,* 1803. By the Rev. Peter Bulmer, A. B. Vicar of Thorpe, and Chaplain to the Right Hon. Lord Muncaster. 8vo. PP. 20. Price 6d. or 5s. per dozen. Spragg. 1803.

THIS Sermon, we are told, was preached on the day on which that very excellent pamphlet, "Important Considerations for the People of this Kingdom," were distributed amongst the inhabitants of the parishes named in the title. The author, in his Advertisement, observes, that "The object of the ensuing Discourse was, to impress the minds of the hearers, especially those of the lower class, with a just sense of the present critical state of the country; and, by pointing out the wisdom and necessity of the measures which have been sanctioned by the Legislature for the general defence and security of the realm, to animate them to prompt and vigorous exertions, in assisting to carry such measures into execution. Its effect, at the time of its delivery, was such, as to induce a wish that its usefulness might be farther extended by means of the press. Its seasonableness, therefore, may be considered as constituting its principal merit." The design of the preacher was in every sense good, and we are happy to learn that it was effectual; indeed, had it not been so, the fault must have been with the hearers, and not with the preacher, for a better application of that inspired and inspiring text—"*Be not ye afraid of them, remember the Lord which is great and terrible, and fight for your brethren, your sons, and your daughters, your wives, and your houses,*" we have never read. The concluding passage we extract with pleasure, and we think our readers will share our gratification. The union of scriptural expression, with the language of the preacher, gives peculiar energy to the whole.

"In the name of the Lord God of Hosts, we have set up our banners;"* and who is this self-confident apostate, this undaunted blasphemer, that he should thus dare to defy the armies of those who trust in the living God.† Vain are thy threats thou proud Usurper! and vain the vaunted prowess of thy mercenary legions! 'Who ever hardened himself against God and prospered?'‡ 'The Lord is our strength and our shield, of whom shall we be afraid?'§ If we 'fear the Lord and serve Him in truth with all our

---

"* Psal. xx. 5." "† See 1 Sam. xvii. 36." "‡ Job. ix. 4." "§ Psal. lxxxi. 1. xxxiii. 20. xxvii. 1."

heart,

heart, we have his word to rely upon, that he will deliver us out of the hand of all our enemies.'* He will not suffer *the Heathen to come into our inheritance; our temples they shall not defile, nor lay our cities in heaps, neither shall they give our dead bodies*, as they have threatened to do, *to be meat for the fowls of the air, and the beasts of the field.*† *Our God, who will not forsake his people for his great name's sake, will fight for us and save us.*‡ This our most inveterate foe shall then no longer *be able to do us violence, the son of wickedness shall not* again have power to *hurt us. Our kingdom shall be established for ever*; and all the world shall know and confess, that *verily there is a reward for the righteous; that, doubtless, there is a God that judgeth in the earth. Peace and plenty shall*, thenceforth, *reign in our borders; and the voice of joy and health shall be heard in our dwellings. Happy are the people that are in such a case; yea, blessed are the people who have the Lord for their God.*§

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### Maurice on the Trinity.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,

THE learned and indefatigable Mr. Maurice, in his elaborate "Dissertation on the Oriental Trinities extracted from the 4th and 5th vol. of his Indian Antiquities," a work of inestimable value to every person professing (what I cannot but believe to be) the *orthodox* faith of a Trinity in Unity, observes as follows, (p. 173, 174.) "The Jews urge the daily recitation enjoined them of that text in deuteronomy, Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord, (Deut. vi. 4.) so express (as they think) upon the unity of God, as an unanswerable argument against the doctrine of the Christian Trinity; but while they do this, they have acknowledged that it is somewhat extraordinary and perplexing, that the name of God should be thrice repeated. And as to the Christians themselves, against whom it is urged as an argument so irrefragable, *they* are almost unanimous, that, in this very sentence, there is a plain indication of a Trinity. If the reader will turn to the original in the Hebrew Bible, he will there find, in the first and last words of this text, two letters of uncommon magnitude, viz. the ע ain, and the ד daleth; of which a similar instance does not occur in the whole volume of the ancient Scriptures. The remarkable distinction of these letters, the Jews themselves allow, was intended to denote a deep and latent mystery in the words. But since, in enforcing the unity of God, a doctrine so plainly and expressly inculcated in this and various other passages, no *mystery* could be intended, their opponents, with great justice, apply it to mean the mystery of the Trinity in Unity. They insist, that it alludes to the *manner* in which God is one; that the unity of the divine essence is an unity that has nothing in common with that of other beings which fall under number; and that, as the Jews in their Book of Prayers express it, God is unus, non unicus."—I per-

"* 2 Kings xvii. 39. 1 Sam. xii. 24." "† Psal. lxxix. 1. 2" "‡ 1 Sam. xii. 22. Deut. xx. 4." "§ Psal. lxxxix. 23. 2 Sam. vii. 16. Psal. lviii. 11. cxlvii. 14. cxviii. 15. cxiv. 15."

fectly

fectly coincide in opinion with the learned writer, that this text contains a plain indication of the Trinity, and I think that the name of God was repeated thrice for this express purpose; and this will be more evident, if we translate the words literally, Hear, O Israel, Jehovah, our God, (or *our Gods*, if the original be admitted to be a plural noun) Jehovah, one." This doctrine of the Trinity then I conceive to be the mystery revealed in this text. But with respect to the distinction of the two letters above-mentioned being written in characters of a larger size, which the Jews on that account conceive were intended to denote a deep and latent mystery, I cannot so readily admit such a conclusion. That the doctrine of the Trinity is a mystery, is true, and that this doctrine is here vindicated, I conceive to be no less true from the words of the text. The two letters above-mentioned then, instead of containing any latent and unintelligible mystery, appear to me to be presented with so prominent a feature to the eye of the Christian reader for the purpose of attracting his especial notice, the one being placed at the beginning of the sentence, the other at the conclusion of it; for if these two letters are joined together, they form the word, עד, expressive of *eternity*; and, consequently, if we admit with the generality of Christians that this text intimates the existence of three persons, this word, expressive of eternity, may be considered as implying the existence of these three persons (the second and third as well as the first) from all eternity, and of course the equality of their Godhead.—— It will be said, perhaps, that this is a fanciful conjecture. It is stated as a conjecture merely, and as such it is submitted to the consideration of your readers, and particularly of the learned author above-mentioned. It certainly is a remarkable circumstance, as Mr. M. observes, no similar instance occurs in the whole volume of the ancient Scriptures.

I am, Sir, your's, &c.

*August* 1, 1803. CLERICUS ANGLICANUS.

## LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

WE hear that a work is in the press, and will soon be published, by Bishop Skinner, of Aberdeen, intended as a defence of episcopacy, particularly that of Scotland, against an attack made on it by the late Dr. Campbell, in his *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*; and concluded with an Address to the Episcopalians in Scotland, recommending their united adherence to the principles by which they are distinguished.

## TO OUR READERS.

THE *Political Summary* is unavoidably postponed, to our great regret, on account of the severe illness of the gentleman by whom it is written.